DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 218 EA 021 843

AUTHOR Burt, James; And Others
TITLE Teacher and Administrator Satisfaction in the School Improvement Process: An Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 223p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Development; Participative Decision Making; *Program Effectiveness; School Based Management; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; *User Satisfaction (Information)
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan

ABSTRACT

The Collaborative School Improvement Process (C-SIP) is a six-step process based on participative decision making and staff development. The identification of participants' perceptions of the program and reasons for variation is the purpose of this study. Data collection is based on a survey of teachers and administrators in 29 participating schools. The return rate and total number of respondents are not stated. With the exception of two schools, findings indicate that the majority of participants perceived the C-CIP process as effective. Reasons for program effectiveness include: shared decision making and goal consensus; active involvement that meets basic human needs; well-organized planning; adequate funding; and utilization of a process facilitator. Recommendations are offered for improving time management, staff commitment, and evaluation. Appendices include a funding statement, a copy of the questionnaire, and tables of responses by school and by group. (LMI)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED320218

# Teacher and Administrator Satisfaction in the School Improvement Process: An Evaluation Report

by

James Burt

Wendell M. Hough

with

William P. Sosnowsky

The Collaborative School Improvement Process (C-SIP)

College of Education

Wayne State University

Detroit, Michigan 48202

(313) 577-1736

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

February 1990

EA021843

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wendell M. Hough

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

## INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF STUDY

During the 1988-89 school year, twenty-nine schools from the metropolitan Detroit area cooperated with Wayne State University in the Collaborative School Improvement Process (C-SIP). To participate in the program, schools make a three year commitment to complete a full cycle of the process. A coordinator to provide assistance and funding is provided by Wayne State University (see Appendix, Table B) for each of these three years. Schools may continue using the process for school improvement efforts beyond the third year.

During this past year, twenty-two elementary, five middle, and two high schools were C-SIP participants. Three elementary schools were in year one of the cycle, four in year two, ten in year three, three in year four and two in year five. Two middle schools were in year one of the cycle, none in years two or five, two in year three and one in year four. One high school was in year one and one in year three.

It is important to keep in mind when reading the data and the analysis of it that the responses represent the perceptions of the respondents and should not be seen as right or wrong answers. The items on the questionnaire are expected outcomes of C-SIP based on the beliefs of those who developed the six-step process. Responses on the questionnaires represent the levels of agreement of participating educators with these expected outcomes as related to C-SIP projects in their individual buildings.

This study will examine responses to eight questions posed to participants in the 1988-89 C-SIP program:

1. What is the level of acceptance of the school improvement process as perceived by teachers, building leadership team members,and building administrators?

2 Do the perceptions of school personnel differ relative to their position as a teacher, building leadership team member, or building administrator?

3. Do these perceptions vary because the participants are associated with elementary, middle/junior high school, or senior high school programs?

4. Do these perceptions vary because the participants are in different phases of the C-SIP cycle?

5. What are the perceptions of involved school personnel about the impact of their schocl improvement project on their school?

6. Do these perceptions differ relative to their position as teacher, building level team member, or building administrator?

7. What are the beliefs of individual school personnel about the personal impact of their school's participation in C-SIP?

8. Do these perceptions vary relative to their position as teacher, building leadership team member, or building administrator?

## A History of the Collaborative School Improvement Process

The Collaborative School Improvement Process (C-SIP) was developed through the combined efforts of the Taylor (Michigan) Public Schools, the Michigan Department of Education, the College of Education at Eastern Michigan University, and the College of Education at Wayne State University. What began as an effort by the Taylor Schools to aid teachers with the implementation of ideas and programs learned about in workshops spread to the planning of a six-step process to aid in the formulation of school improvement plans. This plan was designed by Taylor Schools personnel with the assistance of consultants from Detroit-area universities and intermediate school districts, and the State Department of Education. It was piloted in the Taylor School District during the 1977-78 school year. Eastern Michigan University (1979) and Wayne State University (1981) became involved in working with the Taylor Schools and other area school districts when funding became available from legislation passed by the Michigan Legislature in the Higher Education Appropriations Act of 1979. This project was known originally as the Staff Development for School Improvement Program.

Approximately eighty schools have worked with Wayne State University in the three year cycle of C-SIP since 1981. During the life of this project various reports have been prepared by personnel from the local school districts participating in the C-SIP program, by personnel from the universities who provided facilitators, and by contracted consultants. The format of these reports being different for each major group conducting the evaluations resulted in presentations that made it difficult to compare the different programs. It was the decision of the C-SIP Evaluation Subcommittee to have a common evaluation conducted beginning with the 1987-88 school year programs.

The evaluation instrument currently being used was primarily developed by Dr. Leonard Jensen, a former consultant for the Wayne County Intermediate School District, and was first used to evaluate the 1987-88 C-SIP program. He also developed the model for data

analysis. Questions one through sixteen were used for the 1987-88 evaluation. Questions seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen have been added to this year's evaluation instrument. Some modifications have been made in the model for data analysis as well.

# THE COLLABORATIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

The Collaborative School Improvement Process is a structured six-step process through which school staffs can cooperatively identify and address their most needed areas for school improvement. Furthermore, this six-step process integrates democratic principles of participation in decision-making and utilizes staff development for school improvement.

The six steps of the school improvement process are:

Step I: Awareness, Readiness, and Commitment

The Awareness session includes:

1) a brief history of the program,
2) a discussion of its purpose and the assumptions on which it is based,
3) an explanation of the six-step process, and,
4) a consideration of the benefits of a project for staff development.

Step II: Interactive Needs Assessment

The Interactive Needs Assessment includes:

1) establishment of the goal of the project,
2) determination of operating procedures and job responsibilities, and,
3) election of the Building Leadership Team (BLT).

Step III: Development and Approval of the Plan

The Development and Approval of the Plan includes:

1) the Building Level Team writes the Plan for the project.
2) a facilitator helps to design the strategies for implementing the project; and,

3) interaction with the staff to assure acceptance of the Plan.

Step IV: Implementation and Tailoring includes:

1) carrying out the goals, objectives and activities specified in the Plan,
2) promoting active support of every person in the building from the custodian to the principal, and,
3) focusing on activities engaged in by teachers typically for a period of three to six months.

Step V: Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation includes:

1) determining the degree to which the goals and objectives of the program are being achieved.

Step VI: Interactive Reassessment of Needs (Adoption)

Interactive Reassessment of Needs includes:

1) examining the effectiveness of the completed project;
2) identification of new needs, and,
3) employing the six-step process to another project.

---

Information about funding for local schools for their C-SIP projects is located in the Appendix, Table B.

## METHODOLOGY

Data for evaluating school use of the C-SIP model during the 1988-89 school year was gathered in May, 1989. Each C-SIP school was invited to participate in this evaluation and each affected staff member in each school was invited by the building principal to fill out an evaluation questionnaire. Staff participation in this evaluation was optional. A basic questionnaire consisting of nineteen statements and questions was used. To make the questionnaire relevant for all participants, minor variations exist in questionnaires given to teachers, building leadership team members, and principals (See appendix, Tables C, D, E).

This questionnaire intends to measure perceptions of teachers, building leadership team (BLT) members, and building administrators regarding their satisfaction with the C-SIP process and the outcomes they achieved from implementation of their school improvement plan. Responses by individuals were collected anonymously, however, all responses were tabulated by building and by membership group in that building, i.e. teachers, BLT member, or administrator.

Sixteen statements on each questionnaire required a forced-choice response from participants. The response categories for each of these items was as follows:

| Agree (A) | Moderately Agree (MA) | Slightly Agree (SA) | Slightly Disagree (SD) | Moderately Disagree (MD) | Disagree (D) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Two items appear on each questionnaire that required a narrative response. One of these questions asks participants to assess the strength and weaknesses of the C-SIP process and make suggestions for improvement. The other question asks participants to write their perceptions of their own school improvement project. One part of this item addresses the effect the school improvement plan has had on the school. The second part asks for a response on how participation in the plan has personally affected the respondent.

Question eighteen asks participants their feelings about whether or not C-SIP will continue in their building. Response categories are: Definitely Continue; Probably Continue; Probably Not Continue; and Definitely Not Continue. Respondents were also left space to write comments.

Responses from the questionnaires were tallied by question, by school, and by position within the school. These responses are being reported and analyzed in several different ways.

First, responses to questionnaire items one to sixteen were tallied. A compilation of responses for all teachers, all BLT members, all principals, and a total for all participants are reported in Table 1. Secondly, results are reported for all teachers, all BLT members, and all building administrators by elementary, middle school, and high school affiliation (Tables 2, 3, 4). Next, results are reported for each of three groups (teachers, BLT members, and building administrators) based on year in the C-SIP cycle (year one to five) (Tables 5-13). Analysis of information in these tables is reported along with a comparison with similar data from the 1987-88 evaluation. Next, responses by each of the three groups in each individual school are reported in Tables 14-42.

In the second section of reporting and evaluating data, those questionnaire items which pertain to the program's impact on student achievement were tabluated and analyzed. Questionnaire items six, seven, eight, nine, ten, fourteen, and fifteen are used to measure the perceived impact of C-SIP programs on student achievement. This data is reported in the same way data was reported from items one to sixteen. Table 43 reports responses from all participants; tables 44, 45, 46 responses by group and by school affiliation; tables 47-55 by group and by year in the C-SIP cycle; and tables 56-84 by group in each individual school. Analysis of information in these tables is reported.

Analysis of this data was done by determining the number of responses for each of the six categories of response, converting the number of responses to percentages, and calculating an average for each item analyzed. This average is a weighted average determined by assigning each of the six responses a number (six for Agree, five

for Moderately Agree, four for Slightly Agree, three for Slightly Disagree, two for Moderately Disagree and one for Disagree). This weighted number was multiplied by the number of responses in each category, all categories were then added together, and divided by the total number of responses to determine a weighted average. To give some significance to the magnitude of this average, a scale of relative average levels of agreement has been developed. Responses were also tallied to look at the total number and percentage of responses which fell into one of the three "agree" categories and into one of the three "disagree" categories.

Responses to the narrative questions (17, 18 and 19) were analyzed by group (teachers, BLT members, building administrators) and in total, and reported in a narrative summary.

In the section examining impact on student achievement, no testing of students was done. The information in this section reflects educator's pereptions about the impact of individual school improvement plans on student achievement.

## READING THE TABLES AND CHARTS

Each table has five categories of information listed at the top:

School Code: Each building participating in C-SIP was given a number during its initial year to simplify and objectify reporting data. Tables reporting information for individual schools will have this number. Tables reporting group data will say "None".

Level: "Elem" (Elementary), "Midl Schl" (Middle School), "High Schl" (High School)

Cycle Year: This number reports the number of consecutive years the school has been a C-SIP participant. Group tables report data from all years.

Group: "Teachers", "Building Leadership Team" (BLT), "Building Administrators" or "All"

Questionnaire Items: The numbers of the questionnaire item responses being reported

In addition, "N" represents the number of people responding in each category and "T" equals the total number of responses. For questionnaire items one to sixteen, sixteen responses are possible for each individual.

The six response categories were A (Agree), MA (Moderately Agree), SA (Slightly Agree), SD (Slightly Disagree), MD (Moderately Disagree), and D (Disagree). The number of responses in each category was divided by "T" and the result shown as a percent. The weighted average for each group was calculated by assigning a value of six for A, five for MA, four for SA, three for SD, two for MD, and one for D, respectively, followed by the calculation of the weighted sums and the average for each group.

A scale of relative levels of agreement was developed to help interpret the differences among these averages. The scale is as follows:

**Relative Average Levels of Agreement**

| Range of Average | Subjective Category |
|---|---|
| 5.25-6.00 | AGREE |
| 4.25-5.24 | MODERATELY AGREE |
| 3.51-4.24 | SLIGHTLY AGREE |
| 2.75-3.50 | SLIGHTLY DISAGREE |
| 1.75-2.74 | MODERATELY DISAGREE |
| 1.00-1.74 | DISAGREE |

# QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 1 - 16

## QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 1-16

### All Positions, All Groups, All Years (Table 1)

This table shows data totaled from responses to all questionnaires. The average response for building administrators was highest at 5.30 out of a possible 6.00, followed by building leadership teams members at 5.10, and teachers at 4.43. A table of these averages with a scale of relative average levels of agreement shows:

| POSITION CATEGORY | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE |
|---|---|---|
| Building Administrator | 5.30 | Agree |
| BLT Members | 5.10 | Moderately Agree |
| Teachers | 4.43 | Moderately Agree |
| **TOTAL** | 4.62 | Moderately Agree |

(The data listed under Total reflects that the number of teachers in the study was much larger than the BLT's and building administrators. This caused the Total data to be skewed in the direction of the teacher data.)

Using the average results as one indicator, it would appear that the building administrator's perceptions of the results of the C-SIP program in their schools have the highest level of agreement with the expected outcomes, followed in order by building leadership team members and teachers.

Looking at percentage data and the "Agree" category in Table 1, one can see that building administrators had the highest percentage of "Agree" responses at 50.84, followed closely by BLT members at 48.56 percent, and then teachers at 29.36 percent. In table form this data looks like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Bldg. Admin. | 34 | 50.84 |
| BLT Members | 126 | 48.56 |
| Teachers | 436 | 29.36 |
| TOTAL | 596 | 34.73 |

If the percent of those who responded "Disagree" is used in a similar table, the results look like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Bldg. Admin | 34 | 0.19 |
| BLT Members | 126 | 2.92 |
| Teachers | 436 | 9.57 |
| TOTAL | 596 | 7.60 |

If all categories that show agreement (Agree, Moderately Agree, Slightly Agree) are combined and a similar combination is made of all categories that show disagreement (Disagree, Moderately Disagree, Slightly Disagree) a table of these combined categories shows:

Table 1

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None  Level E-M-H  Cycle Year All

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 436  T= 6719

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1973 | 1837 | 1522 | 509 | 235 | 643 |
| 29.36% | 27.34% | 22.65% | 7.58% | 3.50% | 9.57% |

Average = 4.43

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 126  T= 1983

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 963 | 548 | 321 | 71 | 22 | 58 |
| 48.56% | 27.63% | 16.19% | 3.58% | 1.11% | 2.92% |

Average = 5.10

**Building Administrator**

N= 34  T= 537

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 273 | 168 | 82 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| 50.84% | 31.28% | 15.27% | 2.05% | 0.37% | 0.19% |

Average = 5.30

**Total**

N= 596  T= 9239

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3209 | 2553 | 1925 | 591 | 259 | 702 |
| 34.73% | 27.63% | 20.84% | 6.40% | 2.80% | 7.60% |

Average = 4.62

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| POSITION | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bldg. Admin | 34 | 97.39 | 3.60 |
| BLT Members | 126 | 92.38 | 7.61 |
| Teachers | 436 | 79.36 | 20.64 |
| TOTAL | 596 | 83.20 | 16.80 |

A review of these all position data including averages, percent agree, percent disagree, and combined levels of agree and disagree indicates that building administrators and BLT members have similar perceptions in terms of agreement with expected outcomes. These perceptions are significantly different than those of teachers.

## ALL TEACHERS (TABLE 2)

Data concerning all teachers is categorized by elementary, middle school, and high school, and is totaled for all three groups. A table of relative average levels of agreement for teachers shows:

| LEVEL | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 4.37 | Moderately Agree |
| Middle Sch. | 149 | 4.58 | Moderately Agree |
| High Sch. | 49 | 4.25 | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL | 436 | 4.43 | Moderately Agree |

The data for "Agree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) are as follows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| LEVEL | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 30.61 |
| Middle School | 149 | 30.26 |
| High School | 49 | 20.85 |
| TOTAL | 436 | 29.36 |

A table of showing "Disagree" responses for all teachers looks like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| LEVEL | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 11.47 |
| Middle Sch. | 149 | 7.24 |
| High Sch. | 49 | 7.90 |
| TOTAL | 436 | 9.57 |

The combination of all the levels of Agree and Disagree shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| LEVEL | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 77.57 | 22.43 |
| Middle Sch. | 149 | 82.52 | 17.48 |
| High Sch. | 49 | 77.98 | 22.02 |
| TOTAL | 436 | 79.35 | 20.65 |

A study of data from these four tables indicated that elementary and middle school teachers have very similar perceptions in terms of agreement with expected outcomes. High school teachers have a

significantly lower level of agreement. These figures change, however, for disagreement data. Elementary teachers have the highest level of disagreement followed by high school, then middle school. Elementary teachers, then, have both the highest level of agreement and disagreement with expected outcomes. Elementary and high school teachers have similar overall perceptions.

Table 2

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level E-M-H Cycle Year All

Group Teachers

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Elementary**

N= 238 T= 3584

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1097 | 861 | 822 | 273 | 120 | 411 |
| 30.61% | 24.02% | 22.94% | 7.62% | 3.35% | 11.47% |

Average = 4.37

**Middle School**

N= 149 T= 2363

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 715 | 777 | 458 | 166 | 76 | 171 |
| 30.26% | 32.88% | 19.38% | 7.02% | 3.22% | 7.24% |

Average = 4.58

**High School**

N= 49 T= 772

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 161 | 199 | 242 | 70 | 39 | 61 |
| 20.85% | 25.78% | 31.35% | 9.07% | 5.05% | 7.90% |

Average = 4.25

**Total**

N= 436 T= 6710

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1973 | 1837 | 1522 | 509 | 235 | 643 |
| 29.36% | 27.34% | 22.65% | 7.58% | 3.50% | 9.57% |

Average = 4.43

## ALL BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS (TABLE 3)

Data concerning all BLT members is categorized by elementary, middle school, high school, and is totaled for all three groups. A table of relative average levels of agreement for BLT members shows:

| LEVEL | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 5.07 | Moderately Agree |
| Middle Sch. | 24 | 5.16 | Moderately Agree |
| High Sch. | 8 | 5.24 | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL | 126 | 5.10 | Moderately Agree |

(Because of higher numbers of elementary BLT members, the total data is skewed in favor of this group).

The data for "Agree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) are as follows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| LEVEL | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 48.71 |
| Middle Sch. | 24 | 47.00 |
| High Sch. | 8 | 51.56 |
| TOTAL | 126 | 48.56 |

A table showing "Disagree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) looks like this:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| LEVEL | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 3.33 |
| Middle Sch. | 24 | 2.35 |
| High Sch. | 8 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 126 | 2.92 |

The combination of all levels of Agree and Disagree shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| LEVEL | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 91.98 | 8.02 |
| Middle School | 24 | 93.21 | 6.79 |
| High School | 8 | 94.53 | 5.47 |
| TOTAL | 126 | 92.38 | 7.62 |

A study of data from these four tables indicates that all three levels had similar perceptions in terms of agreement and disagreement with expected outcomes.

Table 3

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level E-M-H Cycle Year All

Group BLT

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Elementary**

N= 94 T= 1472

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 717 | 376 | 261 | 56 | 13 | 49 |
| 48.71% | 25.54% | 17.73% | 3.80% | 0.88% | 3.33% |

Average = 5.07

**Middle School**

N= 24 T= 383

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 180 | 137 | 40 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| 47.00% | 35.77% | 10.44% | 2.35% | 2.09% | 2.35% |

Average = 5.16

**High School**

N= 8 T= 128

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 66 | 35 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 51.56% | 27.34% | 15.63% | 4.69% | 0.78% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.24

**Total**

N= 126 T= 1983

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 963 | 548 | 321 | 71 | 22 | 58 |
| 48.56% | 27.63% | 16.19% | 3.58% | 1.11% | 2.92% |

Average = 5.10

## ALL BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS (TABLE 4)

Table 4 contains data for all elementary, middle,and high school administrators. In most cases, this data is reflective of the building principal's perceptions, however, in larger buildings responses were received from other administrators as well. The following is a table of relative average levels of agreement for this group:

| LEVEL | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 5.35 | Agree |
| Middle School | 10 | 5.34 | Agree |
| High School | 4 | 4.90 | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL | 34 | 5.30 | Agree |

The data for "Agree" responses for all building administrators (in percentages) are as following:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| LEVEL | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 54.72 |
| Middle School | 10 | 51.92 |
| High School | 4 | 28.57 |
| TOTAL | 34 | 50.84 |

A table showing "Disagree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) shows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| LEVEL | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 0.31 |
| Middle School | 10 | 0.00 |
| High School | 4 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 34 | 0.19 |

The combination of all levels of Agree and Disagree shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| LEVEL | N | Total A, MA, SA Categories % | Total D, MD, SD Categories % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 97.49 | 2.51 |
| Middle School | 10 | 96.79 | 3.21 |
| High School | 4 | 98.41 | 1.59 |
| TOTAL | 34 | 97.39 | 2.61 |

A study of data from these four tables indicates elementary and middle school administrators have very similar perceptions in terms of agreement with expected outcomes. High school administrators have a much lower level of maximum agreement. All three groups, however, have negligible percentages of administrators with perceptions that disagree with expected outcomes. In fact, high school administrators have the lowest combined level of disagreement. (The very low number of high school administrators who were surveyed make comparison of their data with the other levels difficult.).

Table 4

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level E-M-H Cycle Year All

Group Bldg Admin

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Elementary**

N= 20 T= 318

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 174 | 94 | 42 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 54.72% | 29.56% | 13.21% | 1.57% | 0.63% | 0.31% |

Average = 5.35

**Middle School**

N= 10 T= 156

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 81 | 52 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.92% | 33.33% | 11.54% | 3.21% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.34

**High School**

N= 4 T= 63

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 22 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.57% | 34.92% | 34.92% | 1.59% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.90

**Total**

N= 34 T= 537

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 273 | 168 | 82 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| 50.84% | 31.28% | 15.27% | 2.05% | 0.37% | 0.19% |

Average = 5.30

## DATA BY YEARS IN C-SIP CYCLE

This next section will look at the data for all groups based on the year their school is in the C-SIP cycle. As explained earlier in this report, school staffs make a three year commitment to using the process during the initial year of the program. (Wayne State University feels this commitment is necessary if real change in buildings is to be realized. The literature on the change process supports this belief that substantitive change in schools takes at least three years to complete). Data is being analyzed by year in the cycle to see if this position has any effect on perceptions of those involved in C-SIP.

Most schools in the 1988-89 program are in cycle years one, two, or three. Six schools are in year one (three elementary, two middle schools, and one high school); four are in year two (all elementary); and thirteen are in year three (ten elementary, two middle schools, and one high school). In addition, some schools have elected to continue their involvement with the C-SIP program beyond the three year initial commitment. Four schools are in year four (three elementary and one middle school) and two are in year five (both elementary).

Data will be analyzed separately for elementary, middle schools, and high school teachers, and later for BLT members and building administrators.

## ALL TEACHERS, YEARS IN C-SIP CYCLE (TABLES 5,6,7)

### Elementary Teachers (Table 5)

This table shows data from elementary teachers in cycle years one (three schools), two (four schools), three (ten schools), four (three schools) and five (two schools). A table of relative average levels of agreement shows:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 4.17 | Slightly Agree |
| 2 | 49 | 4.88 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 124 | 4.18 | Slightly Agree |
| 4. | 20 | 4.07 | Slightly Agree |
| 5 | 14 | 4.96 | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL | 238 | 4.37 | Moderately Agree |

A table showing "Agree" responses all for all teachers (in percentages) looks like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 30.42 |
| 2 | 49 | 40.71 |
| 3 | 124 | 28.44 |
| 4 | 20 | 14.01 |
| 5 | 14 | 37.39 |
| TOTAL | 238 | 30.61 |

A table of "Disagree" responses for elementary teachers (in percentage) shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEARS | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 17.72 |
| 2 | 49 | 4.35 |
| 3 | 124 | 14.41 |
| 4 | 20 | 10.10 |
| 5 | 14 | 0.45 |
| TOTAL | 238 | 11.47 |

A table showing the combination of all levels of Agree and Disagree for elementary teachers shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| | | TOTAL A, MA SA CATEGORIES | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES |
|---|---|---|---|
| YEAR | N | % | % |
| 1 | 31 | 70.69 | 29.31 |
| 2 | 49 | 88.40 | 11.60 |
| 3 | 124 | 73.86 | 26.14 |
| 4 | 20 | 71.99 | 28.01 |
| 5 | 14 | 93.25 | 6.75 |
| TOTAL | 238 | 77.57 | 22.73 |

Summarizing data from these four tables shows teachers in years two and five had a significantly higher acceptance of C-SIP concepts than the other three years. However, teachers in year four had significantly lower levels of maximum agreement than teachers in other years. Also, teachers in years, one, three, and four had significantly higher levels of disagreement.

Table 5

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level Elem Cycle Year All
Group Teachers
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 31 T= 457

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 139 | 114 | 70 | 33 | 20 | 81 |
| 30.42% | 24.95% | 15.32% | 7.22% | 4.38% | 17.72% |

Average = 4.17

Year 02

N= 49 T= 759

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 309 | 213 | 149 | 43 | 12 | 33 |
| 40.71% | 28.06% | 19.63% | 5.67% | 1.58% | 4.35% |

Average = 4.88

Year 03

N= 124 T= 1839

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 523 | 369 | 466 | 144 | 72 | 265 |
| 28.44% | 20.07% | 25.34% | 7.83% | 3.92% | 14.41% |

Average = 4.18

Year 04

N= 20 T= 307

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 43 | 98 | 80 | 41 | 14 | 31 |
| 14.01% | 31.92% | 26.06% | 13.36% | 4.56% | 10.10% |

Average = 4.07

Year 05

N= 14 T= 222

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 83 | 67 | 57 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| 37.39% | 30.18% | 25.68% | 5.41% | 0.90% | 0.45% |

Average = 4.96

Total

N= 238 T= 3584

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1097 | 861 | 822 | 273 | 120 | 411 |
| 30.61% | 24.02% | 22.94% | 7.62% | 3.35% | 11.47% |

Average = 4.37

MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS (TABLE 6)

This table shows data from middle schools in cycle years one (two schools, three (two schools), and four (one school). A table of relative average levels of agreement shows:

| YEARS | N | PERCENT AGREE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 4.15 | Slightly Agree |
| 3 | 60 | 4.98 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | 30 | 4.64 | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL | 149 | 4.58 | Moderately Agree |

The table of "Agree" responses for all teachers (in percentages) shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEARS | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 24.73 |
| 3 | 60 | 33.68 |
| 4 | 30 | 34.24 |
| TOTAL | 149 | 30.26 |

The table of "Disagree" responses for middle school teachers (in percentages) look like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEARS | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 13.49 |
| 3 | 60 | 1.99 |
| 4 | 30 | 5.46 |
| TOTAL | 149 | 7.24 |

The table of combined levels of the Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A,MA,SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D,MD,SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 71.52 | 28.48 |
| 3 | 60 | 93.40 | 6.60 |
| 4 | 30 | 82.36 | 17.64 |
| TOTAL | 149 | 82.52 | 17.48 |

A study of data from these four tables shows schools in cycle years three and four have a higher acceptance of C-SIP concepts than the schools in cycle year one. In addition, cycle year one schools had a higher level of disagreement than cycle year four schools and a significantly higher level of disagreement than cycle three year schools. While schools in years three and four were similar in acceptance, year four schools had a higher level of disagreement than year three schools.

This data suggests that levels of agreement with C-SIP concepts is more likely to be higher in schools where the program has been in use for a while than it might be in schools that are beginning their work with C-SIP.

One should be careful when making generalizations about this data, however, based on the limited number of schools in each cycle year.

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS (TABLE 7)

Table 7 shows data collected from the two high schools which participated in this years C-SIP program (one in cycle year one, one in year three). The table of relative average levels of agreement looks like this:

Table 6

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level Mid Sch Cycle Year All
Group Teachers
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 59 T= 934

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 231 | 232 | 205 | 100 | 40 | 126 |
| 24.73% | 24.84% | 21.95% | 10.71% | 4.28% | 13.49% |

Average = 4.15

Year 02

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03

N= 60 T= 953

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 321 | 404 | 165 | 35 | 9 | 19 |
| 33.68% | 42.39% | 17.31% | 3.67% | 0.94% | 1.99% |

Average = 4.98

Year 04

N= 30 T= 476

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 163 | 141 | 88 | 31 | 27 | 26 |
| 34.24% | 29.62% | 18.49% | 6.51% | 5.67% | 5.46% |

Average = 4.64

Year 05

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total

N= 149 T= 2363

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 715 | 777 | 458 | 166 | 76 | 171 |
| 30.26% | 32.88% | 19.38% | 7.02% | 3.22% | 7.24% |

Average = 4.58

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 4.02 | Slightly Agree |
| 3 | 18 | 4.64 | Moderately Agree |
| TOTAL | 49 | 4.25 | Moderately Agree |

A table of relative levels of maximum agreement shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 20.61 |
| 3 | 18 | 21.28 |
| TOTAL | 49 | 20.88 |

A table of relative levels of maximum disagreement shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 12.24 |
| 3 | 18 | 0.35 |
| TOTAL | 49 | 7.78 |

The table of combines levels all Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINES LEELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 70.82 | 29.18 |
| 3 | 18 | 90.43 | 9.57 |
| TOTAL | 49 | 78.08 | 21.92 |

Looking at the data from these two schools shows both have similar levels of agreement about C-SIP concepts. Teachers in the year one school have a significantly higher level of disagreement.

This two year data and the limited sample from each year are not sufficient to suggest any relationship between levels of perception and years in C-SIP for high school teachers.

Table 7

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level High School Cycle Year All
Group Teachers
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 31 T= 490

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 101 | 108 | 138 | 45 | 38 | 60 |
| 20.61% | 22.04% | 28.16% | 9.18% | 7.76% | 12.24% |

Average = 4.02

Year 02

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03

N= 18 T= 282

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60 | 91 | 104 | 25 | 1 | 1 |
| 21.28% | 32.27% | 36.88% | 8.87% | 0.35% | 0.35% |

Average = 4.64

Year 04

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0

Year 05

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total

N= 49 T= 771

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 161 | 199 | 242 | 70 | 39 | 60 |
| 20.88% | 25.81% | 31.39% | 9.08% | 5.06% | 7.78% |

Average = 4.25

## ALL BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS, YEARS IN C-SIP CYCLE (TABLES 8, 9, 10)

### Elementary BLT Members (Table 8)

Table 8 contains data from all staff persons who were members of building leadership teams. Elementary schools were participating in all cycles from year one to year five. The following is a table of relative average levels of agreement for this group:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 5.09 | Moderately Agree |
| 2 | 16 | 5.36 | Agree |
| 3 | 37 | 4.96 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | 18 | 4.81 | Moderately Agree |
| 5 | 9 | 5.55 | Agree |
| TOTAL | 94 | 5.07 | Moderately Agree |

A table showing "Agree" responses for all elementary BLT members (in percentages) shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 40.09 |
| 2 | 16 | 63.45 |
| 3 | 37 | 48.12 |
| 4 | 18 | 33.33 |
| 5 | 9 | 68.53 |
| TOTAL | 94 | 48.71 |

A table of "Disagree" responses for this group (in percentages) looks like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 0.46 |
| 2 | 16 | 2.01 |
| 3 | 37 | 6.34 |
| 4 | 18 | 2.15 |
| 5 | 19 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 94 | 3.33 |

A table showing the combination of all levels of Agree and all levels of Disagree shows the following:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 94.93 | 5.07 |
| 2 | 16 | 95.18 | 4.82 |
| 3 | 37 | 88.18 | 11.82 |
| 4 | 18 | 91.04 | 8.96 |
| 5 | 19 | 99.30 | 0.70 |
| TOTAL | 94 | 91.99 | 8.01 |

While data on relative levels of maximum agreement showed some significant variation between some cycle years, there is no clear trend to suggest any relationship between levels of perception and years in C-SIP. This lack of evidence for trends is supported by information in maximum disagreement table and the combined levels table. There is a slight difference in data for cycle year three schools when compared with other years.

Table 8

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level Elem Cycle Year All
Group BLT
Questionnaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 14 T= 217

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 87 | 75 | 44 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 40.09% | 34.56% | 20.28% | 4.61% | 0.00% | 0.46% |

Average = 5.09

Year 02

N= 16 T= 249

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 158 | 44 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 5 |
| 63.45% | 17.67% | 14.06% | 2.81% | 0.00% | 2.01% |

Average = 5.36

Year 03

N= 37 T= 584

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 281 | 145 | 89 | 26 | 6 | 37 |
| 48.12% | 24.83% | 15.24% | 4.45% | 1.03% | 6.34% |

Average = 4.96

Year 04

N= 18 T= 279

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 93 | 85 | 76 | 12 | 7 | 6 |
| 33.33% | 30.47% | 27.24% | 4.30% | 2.51% | 2.15% |

Average = 4.81

Year 05

N= 9 T= 143

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 98 | 27 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.53% | 18.88% | 11.89% | 0.70% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.55

Total

N= 94 T= 1472

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 717 | 376 | 261 | 56 | 13 | 49 |
| 48.71% | 25.54% | 17.73% | 3.80% | 0.88% | 3.33% |

Average = 5.07

## Middle School BLT Members (Table 9)

Table 9 shows data collected from middle school building leadership team members. This data comes from two cycle year one schools and two cycle year three schools. (The BLT members for the one cycle year four school did not turn in questionnaires). The following table shows the relative average levels of agreement for this group:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 5.10 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 10 | 5.25 | Agree |
| TOTAL | 24 | 5.16 | Moderately Agree |

A table showing relative levels of maximum agreement gives the following information:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 49.78 |
| 3 | 10 | 43.13 |
| TOTAL | 24 | 47.00 |

The table of relative levels of maximum disagreement looks like this:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 3.59 |
| 3 | 10 | 0.63 |
| TOTAL | 24 | 2.35 |

The table of combined levels of all Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following:

**COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE**

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 90.13 | 9.87 |
| 3 | 10 | 97.49 | 2.51 |
| TOTAL | 24 | 93.21 | 6.79 |

Comparisons of data between the two groups show both have similar levels of agreement with C-SIP concepts. Levels of disagreement are slightly higher for year one schools. There are insufficient data, however, to say this represents a significant trend.

Table 9

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level Mid Schl Cycle Year All
Group BLT
Questionaire Items

Year 01
N= 14 T= 223

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 111 | 69 | 21 | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| 49.78% | 30.94% | 9.42% | 2.69% | 3.59% | 3.59% |

Average = 5.10

Year 02
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 10 T= 160

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 69 | 68 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 43.13% | 42.50% | 11.88% | 1.88% | 0.00% | 0.63% |

Average = 5.25

Year 04
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 24 T= 383

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 180 | 137 | 40 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| 47.00% | 35.77% | 10.44% | 2.35% | 2.09% | 2.35% |

Average = 5.16

## High School BLT Members (Table 10)

There are two high schools participating in this year's C-SIP program,one in cycle year one and one in cycle year three. Each had a building leadership team with four members responding to the survey.

The average level of agreement for the year one school was 5.33 (Agree) and for the year three school 5.16 (Moderately Agree) with an overall average of 5.24 (Moderately Agree).

The levels of maximum agreement percentages were 50.00 and 53.13 for the first and third year schools respectively. The overall percentage was 51.56. Levels of maximum disagreement percentages were 0.00 for both schools.

The table of combined levels of all Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following results:

### COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 96.87 | 3.13 |
| 3 | 4 | 92.19 | 7.81 |
| TOTAL | 8 | 94.53 | 5.47 |

The amount of data available prevents one from drawing conclusions relative to agreement being related to years in the program. Both groups appear to be in agreement with the goals and concepts of C-SIP.

Table 10

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level High Schl Cycle Year All
Group BLT
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01
N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 50.00% | 35.94% | 10.94% | 3.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.33

Year 02
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 53.13% | 18.75% | 20.31% | 6.25% | 1.56% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.16

Year 04
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 8 T= 128

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 66 | 35 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 51.56% | 27.34% | 15.63% | 4.69% | 0.78% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.24

## All Building Administrators, Years in C-SIP Cycle (Tables 11,12, 13)

### Elementary Administrators (Table 11)

Table 11 contains data collected from all elementary building administrators. It is probable that all of these people are principals since there was only one response from an administrator per building. Elementary schools were participating in all cycles from year one to year five. The following is a table of relative average levels of agreement for these administrators:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 5.38 | Agree |
| 2 | 4 | 5.14 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 8 | 5.38 | Agree |
| 4 | 3 | 5.28 | Agree |
| 5 | 2 | 5.88 | Agree |
| TOTAL | 20 | 5.35 | Agree |

The table of "Agree" responses for all elementary administrators (in percentages) shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 47.92 |
| 2 | 4 | 43.75 |
| 3 | 8 | 54.33 |
| 4 | 3 | 52.17 |
| 5 | 2 | 93.75 |
| TOTAL | 20 | 54.72 |

The table of "Disagree" responses for this group (in percentages) is as follows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 8 | 0.78 |
| 4 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 2 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 20 | 0.31 |

The following table shows the combination of all levels of Agree and all levels of Disagree for elementary administrators:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 4 | 95.31 | 4.69 |
| 3 | 8 | 96.86 | 3.14 |
| 4 | 3 | 97.83 | 2.17 |
| 5 | 2 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 20 | 97.49 | 2.51 |

Data from these tables for this group suggest a minor trend toward increases in agreement as time in the program increases. The overall acceptance of the C-SIP program appears to be very high, exceeding 97%.

Table 11

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Elem
Cycle Year All
Group Bldg Admin
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 3 T= 48

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 47.92% | 41.67% | 10.42% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.38

Year 02

N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28 | 20 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 43.75% | 31.25% | 20.31% | 4.69% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.14

Year 03

N= 8 T= 128

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 69 | 42 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 53.91% | 32.81% | 10.16% | 0.78% | 1.56% | 0.78% |

Average = 5.34

Year 04

N= 3 T= 46

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 52.17% | 26.09% | 19.57% | 2.17% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.28

Year 05

N= 2 T= 32

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 93.75% | 0.00% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.88

Total

N= 20 T= 318

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 174 | 94 | 42 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 54.72% | 29.56% | 13.21% | 1.57% | 0.63% | 0.31% |

Average = 5.35

## Middle School Administrators (Table 12)

Table 12 shows data concerning middle school administrators participating in C-SIP. As there are five schools participating and ten respondents, it is safe to assume that assistant principals as well as principals returned questionnaires.

**RELATIVE AVERAGE LEVELS OF AGREEMENT**

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 5.24 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 3 | 5.54 | Agree |
| 4 | 1 | 5.31 | Agree |
| TOTAL | 10 | 5.34 | Agree |

A table of levels of maximum agreement shows:

**RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT**

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 48.91 |
| 3 | 3 | 60.42 |
| 4 | 1 | 43.75 |
| TOTAL | 10 | 51.92 |

The table of levels of maximum disagreement is as follows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 1 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 10 | 0.00 |

The following table shows the combination of all levels of Agree and all levels of Disagree for middle school administrators:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 95.65 | 4.35 |
| 3 | 3 | 97.92 | 2.08 |
| 4 | 1 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 10 | 96.79 | 3.21 |

This data from these four tables shows overall acceptance of C-SIP by middle school administrators is very high, exceeding 96%. There appears to be a slight trend in favor of increased acceptance by these C-SIP principals as time with the program increases.

Table 12

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None | Level Mid Schl | Cycle Year All
Group Bldg. Admin
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 6 T= 92

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45 | 28 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 48.91% | 30.43% | 16.30% | 4.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.24

Year 02

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03

N= 3 T= 48

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 60.42% | 35.42% | 2.08% | 2.08% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.54

Year 04

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 43.75% | 43.75% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.31

Year 05

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total

N= 10 T= 156

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 81 | 52 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.92% | 33.33% | 11.54% | 3.21% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.34

## High School Administrators (Table 13)

There were two high schools participating and four administrators responded by returning the questionnaire.

The average level of agreement for the year one school was 5.31 (Agree) and for the year three school 4.77 (Moderately Agree).

The levels of maximum agreement percentages were 68.75 and 14.89 for the first and third year schools respectively. The overall percentage was 28.57. Levels of maximum disagreement were 0.00 for both schools.

The table of combined levels of all Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following results:

### COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 93.75 | 6.25 |
| 3 | 3 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL | 4 | 98.41 | 1.59 |

The limited amount of data makes accurate analysis very difficult. While it appears that perceptions may increase with time in the program, there is insufficient evidence to support this appearance of a trend.

Table 13

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level High Schl Cycle Year All
Group Bldg Admin
Questionaire Items 1-16

Year 01

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.75% | 0.00% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.31

Year 02

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03

N= 3 T= 47

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.89% | 46.81% | 38.30% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.77

Year 04

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0

Year 05

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total

N= 4 T= 63

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 22 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.57% | 34.92% | 34.92% | 1.59% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.90

## ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS #1-16

This analysis will look at the data generated from participant surveys in two ways: first, an analysis will be done of this year's data, and secondly, a comparison will be made with data generated from last year's surveys.

Looking at the 1988-89 data reporting all groups in Table 1, it is clear that perceptions of administrators are more in agreement with expected outcomes of C-SIP than are those of building leadership team members and teachers. In all four ways data was delineated (relative average levels of agreement, maximum agreement, maximum disagreement, and combined levels) the results clearly show that administrators are most in agreement and least in disagreement, followed by BLT members and the teachers.

It is difficult to ascertain possible explanations from this data as questionnaire items require a forced-choice response and do not ask participants to explain why they marked an item in a certain way. One possible explanation for the differences in levels of agreement could be related to an issue of ownership for school improvement. As ownership for the outcome increases so may the level of agreement with the outcomes. Building administrators may have more of a stake in the outcome of their C-SIP projects than BLT members or teachers. The ultimate responsibility for the quality of the school and its educational outcomes rests with the building principal. He or she is the main person accountable and makes decisions (including whether or not to engage in school improvement plans or efforts) that effect the direction of the school.

Building Leadership Team members have the next highest level of ownership for a school improvement plan. This committee is charged with making decisions and recommendations that will affect staff support for the plan, its implementation, and its success. All the work and investment of time made by these committee members may give them a strong ownership for the plan's success. The principal, in most cases, is a BLT member as well. Finally, teachers have the least ownership of school improvement efforts because they

have the least amount of involvement of the three groups.. The C-SIP plan does include staff input and decision-making in all phases of the process which does account for the high level of agreement for this group. The combined levels of agreement data for teachers shows that four out of every five teachers surveyed agreed that the expected outcomes of C-SIP were indeed realized outcomes to some degree in their own buildings. It is not a question,then, of whether or not these three groups agree with expected outcomes. They all do. The question is degree of agreement and that may have something to do with the stake one has in the final outcome. (More on this issue of ownership appears in the Summary Analysis section). Other possible explanations certainly exist for this discrepancy in addition to this notion of ownership for the plans.

Data from the total teacher, building leadership team and administrator tables (Tables 2,3,4) shows that while these three groups differ in their levels of agreement, levels within each group seem to show a consistent level of agreement. In other words, elementary, middle school, and high school members in each group seem to have similar levels of agreement. Despite some differences appearing in some of the levels of agreement or disagreement tables for each level, the overall perceptions are quite similar. No particular level appears to be driving the data in one direction or another.

Looking at the data based on the number of years participating in C-SIP, no overall pattern emerges. There is some slight evidence that how long you have participated might have made a difference to high school teachers, middle school BLT members and administrators, and to high school administrators. One should be cautious, however, about drawing conclusions from the limited sample represented in these groups. Also, levels of agreement were highest among both fifth year elementary groups. However, fourth year levels of agreement were lower than those for third year schools so there is no real evidence of a trend at this level.

It is important to note at this time the effect that two schools in particular had on the total teacher data. In one cycle year three elementary school, there were 142 "Disagree" responses on the

surveys. This represented 75% of the total number of responses for this school to questionnaire items 1-16. The elementary school with the next highest percentage of "Disagree" responses was 37%. 54% of all the "Disagree" responses for cycle year three schools came from one of ten schools. 142 of 411 total teacher "Disagree" responses (35%) came from one of twenty-two elementary schools. Similar results came from one cycle year one middle school. 112 of 126 "Disagree" responses (88%) for cycle year one middle schools came from this school while 12% of the "Disagree" responses came from the other school. This school contributed 65% of the total "Disagree" responses for all middle schools. The other four schools accounted for 35% of these responses. Based on the fact that these numbers are so different than the other twenty-seven schools who participated, one may look for building problems being a cause of high disagreement rather than the C-SIP model or process.

**1987-88, 1988-89 Data - A Comparison**

Tables 85, 86, 87, and 88 illustrate data for total responses (all groups), all teachers, all building leadership team members, and all building administrators for the last two years of C-SIP. This is data taken from Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 for both years. (Abbreviations on the charts are as follows: RALA - Relative Average Levels of Agreement; RLMA - Relative Level of Maximum Agreement; RLMD - Relative Level of Maximum Disagreement; and CLA, CLD - Combined Levels of Agree and Combined Levels of Disagree).

Looking at Table 85, one will see that relative average levels of agreement are up significantly for all three groups when this year's data is compared with 1987-88 data. Maximum Agreement rates are steady for administrators and teachers and up ten percentage points for BLT members. Maximum Disagreement percentages are down for Administrators and BLT members, and up slightly for teachers. Combined levels of agreement are the same for teachers, up six percentage points for administrators, and up twelve for BLT members.

Table 86 illustrates comparative teacher data. Relative average levels of agreement are similar for elementary and high school teachers and up significantly from 3.76 to 4.58 for middle school teachers. This significantly higher level of agreement for middle school is also evident in the Maximum Agreement data and the Combined Levels of Agreement data. Elementary and High School data remained the same in these two charts. Maximum Disagreement data was up slightly for elementary teachers and down slightly for middle school teachers.

Relative Average Levels of Agreement were up significantly in all three groups of BLT members as illustrated in Table 87. Maximum Disagreement was similarly down in all groups. Combined Agreement Levels were up significantly and Combined Disagreement Levels down significantly, particularly among middle school BLT members.

Table 88 illustrates administrator data. Relative Average data was up for elementary and middle school administrators, but down for high school. Maximum Agreement data was also up for these two groups and down significantly for high school. Combined Agreement Levels were up for all administrators (high school less than the other levels) and Combined Disagreement Levels) and Combined Disagreement Levels down similarly.

This comparison indicates that 1988-89 participants had higher levels of agreement with expected outcomes of C-SIP than 1987-88 participants. There were slightly higher levels of agreement for all teachers, high school teachers, and high school BLT members. Data showed moderately higher levels for all administrators, and elementary and middle school administrators. Significant increases in levels of agreement were recorded in total BLT data, in middle school teachers' data, and in elementary and middle school BLT data. Finally, levels of agreement were down slightly for elementary teachers and high school administrators.

## Table 85

### All Participants, All Years

| 1987-88 | RALA | 1988-89 |
|---|---|---|
| 5.09 | Bldg. Admin. | 5.30 |
| 4.49 | BLT | 5.10 |
| 4.25 | Teachers | 4.43 |
| 4.34 | Total | 4.62 |
| | **RLMA** | |
| 52.50 | Bldg. Admin. | 50.84 |
| 38.07 | BLT | 48.56 |
| 27.76 | Teachers | 29.36 |
| 30.80 | Total | 34.73 |
| | **RMLD** | |
| 2.50 | Bldg. Admin. | .19 |
| 5.05 | BLT | 2.92 |
| 8.53 | Teachers | 9.57 |
| 7.60 | Total | 7.60 |

### CLA, CLD

| Agree | Disagree | | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 91.75 | 7.75 | Bldg. Admin. | 97.39 | 3.60 |
| 80.62 | 13.27 | BLT | 92.38 | 7.61 |
| 77.32 | 18.87 | Teachers | 79.36 | 20.64 |
| 78.56 | 17.31 | Total | 83.20 | 16.80 |

Table 86

All Teachers

| 1987-88 | RALA | 1988-89 |
|---|---|---|
| 4.37 | Elem. | 4.37 |
| 3.76 | M.S. | 4.58 |
| 4.14 | H.S. | 4.25 |
| 4.25 | Total | 4.43 |

RLMA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 31.95 | Elem. | 30.61 |
| 10.88 | M.S. | 30.62 |
| 22.59 | H.S. | 20.85 |
| 27.76 | Total | 29.36 |

RLMD

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8.52 | Elem. | 11.47 |
| 10.63 | M.S. | 7.24 |
| 7.49 | H.S. | 7.90 |
| 8.53 | Total | 9.57 |

CLA, CLD

| Agree | Disagree | | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 79.21 | 16.78 | Elem. | 77.57 | 22.43 |
| 67.39 | 30.38 | M.S. | 82.52 | 17.48 |
| 76.17 | 19.86 | H.S. | 77.98 | 22.02 |
| 77.32 | 18.87 | Total | 79.35 | 20.65 |

Table 87

ALL BLT MEMBERS

| 1987-88 | RALA | 1988-89 |
|---|---|---|
| 4.42 | Elem. | 5.07 |
| 4.56 | M.S. | 5.16 |
| 4.83 | H.S. | 5.24 |
| 4.49 | Total | 5.10 |
| | **RLMA** | |
| 36.55 | Elem. | 48.71 |
| 43.18 | M.S. | 47.00 |
| 43.01 | H.S. | 51.56 |
| 38.07 | Total | 48.56 |
| | **RLMD** | |
| 4.82 | Elem. | 3.33 |
| 7.95 | M.S. | 2.35 |
| 4.41 | H.S. | 0.00 |
| 5.05 | Total | 2.92 |

**CLA, CLD**

| Agree | Disagree | | Agree | Disagee |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 79.28 | 13.17 | Elem. | 91.98 | 8.02 |
| 76.71 | 22.16 | M.S. | 93.21 | 6.79 |
| 90.44 | 8.09 | H.S. | 94.53 | 5.47 |
| 80.62 | 13.27 | Total | 92.38 | 7.62 |

Table 88

All Building Administrators

| 1987-88 | RALA | 1988-89 |
|---|---|---|
| 5.07 | Elem. | 5.35 |
| 4.84 | M.S. | 5.34 |
| 5.53 | H.S. | 4.90 |
| 5.09 | Total | 5.30 |
| | **RLMA** | |
| 51.49 | Elem. | 54.72 |
| 43.75 | M.S. | 51.92 |
| 71.88 | H.S. | 28.57 |
| 52.50 | Total | 50.84 |
| | **RLMD** | |
| 2.98 | Elem. | 0.31 |
| 0.00 | M.S. | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | H.S. | 0.00 |
| 2.50 | Total | 0.19 |

CLA, CLD

| Agree | Disagree | | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 91.37 | 8.04 | Elem. | 97.49 | 2.51 |
| 90.63 | 9.38 | M.S. | 96.79 | 3.21 |
| 96.88 | 3.13 | H.S. | 98.41 | 1.59 |
| 91.75 | 7.75 | Total | 97.39 | 2.61 |

# QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 1-16

# RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS

Table 14

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 66 Level Elem Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 13 T= 174

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | 39 | 30 | 19 | 9 | 43 |
| 19.54% | 22.41% | 17.24% | 10.92% | 5.17% | 24.71% |

Average = 3.66

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 79

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21 | 28 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.58% | 35.44% | 27.85% | 10.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.78

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18.75% | 56.25% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.94

Table 15

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 67 Level Elem Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 7 T= 109

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 10 | 37 |
| 12.84% | 15.60% | 15.60% | 12.84% | 9.17% | 33.94% |

Average = 3.08

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 74

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | 28 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 29.73% | 37.84% | 28.38% | 2.70% | 0.00% | 1.35% |

Average = 4.91

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 56.25% | 37.50% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.50

Table 16

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 68 Level Elem Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 11 T= 174

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 91 | 58 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 52.30% | 33.33% | 13.22% | 0.00% | 0.57% | 0.57% |

Average = 5.35

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.75% | 29.69% | 1.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.67

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.75% | 31.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.69

Table 17

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 62 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 19 T= 296

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 158 | 71 | 33 | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| 53.38% | 23.99% | 11.15% | 4.05% | 1.69% | 5.74% |

Average = 5.06

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 62

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 82.26% | 16.13% | 1.61% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.81

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.50

Table 18

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 63 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 12 T= 188

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 88 | 73 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| 46.81% | 38.83% | 11.70% | 1.60% | 0.00% | 1.06% |

Average = 5.28

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 6 T= 96

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 71 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 73.96% | 17.71% | 6.25% | 2.08% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.64

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 56.25% | 31.25% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.44

Table 19

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 64 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 4 T= 63

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.98% | 31.75% | 41.27% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.86

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 59

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 50.85% | 16.95% | 22.03% | 5.08% | 0.00% | 5.08% |

Average = 4.98

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 31.25% | 56.25% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.19

Table 20

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 65 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 14 T= 212

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 46 | 49 | 68 | 28 | 7 | 14 |
| 21.70% | 23.11% | 32.08% | 13.21% | 3.30% | 6.60% |

Average = 4.27

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 2 T= 32

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 7 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18.75% | 21.88% | 46.88% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 6.25% |

Average = 4.34

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.75% | 12.50% | 12.50% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.44

Table 21

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 49 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 16 T= 236

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | 40 | 77 | 45 | 15 | 39 |
| 8.47% | 16.95% | 32.63% | 19.07% | 6.36% | 16.53% |

Average = 3.53

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 1 T= 15

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 13.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 6.67% | 6.67% | 73.33% |

Average = 1.87

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 50.00% | 31.25% | 6.25% | 12.50% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.19

Table 22

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 51 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 6 T= 75

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 54 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 72.00% | 22.67% | 5.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.67

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 46

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 86.96% | 8.70% | 4.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.83

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 75.00% | 18.75% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.69

Table 23

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 52 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 19 T= 246

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 46 | 36 | 99 | 27 | 11 | 27 |
| 18.70% | 14.63% | 40.24% | 10.98% | 4.47% | 10.98% |

Average = 3.99

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 21 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 50.00% | 32.81% | 15.63% | 1.56% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.31

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 87.50% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.88

Table 24

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 53 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 14 T= 216

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 53 | 57 | 74 | 21 | 6 | 5 |
| 24.54% | 26.39% | 34.26% | 9.72% | 2.78% | 2.31% |

Average = 4.53

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 62

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 23 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.61% | 37.10% | 11.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.40

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18.75% | 81.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.19

Table 25

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 54 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 15 T= 234

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | 43 | 104 | 20 | 9 | 18 |
| 17.09% | 18.38% | 44.44% | 8.55% | 3.85% | 7.69% |

Average = 4.13

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 6 T= 96

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | 25 | 29 | 7 | 1 | 7 |
| 28.13% | 26.04% | 30.21% | 7.29% | 1.04% | 7.29% |

Average = 4.51

**Building Administrator**

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Table 26

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 55 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 36 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.06% | 56.25% | 26.56% | 3.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.81

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 79

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | 25 | 18 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 32.91% | 31.65% | 22.78% | 2.53% | 3.80% | 6.33% |

Average = 4.68

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31.25% | 43.75% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.06

Table 27

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 57 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 25 T= 396

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 174 | 107 | 69 | 18 | 7 | 21 |
| 43.94% | 27.02% | 17.42% | 4.55% | 1.77% | 5.30% |

Average = 4.91

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 80

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| 52.50% | 32.50% | 8.75% | 3.75% | 0.00% | 2.50% |

Average = 5.26

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 81.25% | 12.50% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.75

Table 28

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 58 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 9 T= 136

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 116 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 85.29% | 8.82% | 1.47% | 0.74% | 2.21% | 1.47% |

Average = 5.70

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 47

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 82.98% | 8.51% | 4.26% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 4.26% |

Average = 5.62

**Building Administrator**

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Table 29

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 60 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 3 T= 47

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| 17.02% | 31.91% | 21.28% | 0.00% | 6.38% | 23.40% |

Average = 3.83

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 47

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 82.98% | 17.02% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.83

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 93.75% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.94

Table 30

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 61 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 13 T= 189

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 18 | 142 |
| 1.59% | 3.17% | 5.29% | 5.29% | 9.52% | 75.13% |

Average = 1.57

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 48

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 1 | 10 |
| 4.17% | 18.75% | 29.17% | 25.00% | 2.08% | 20.83% |

Average = 3.35

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 43.75% | 37.50% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 6.25% |

Average = 5.06

Table 31

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 42 Level Elem Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 5 T= 75

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 24 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 0 |
| 10.67% | 32.00% | 41.33% | 13.33% | 2.67% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.35

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 6 T= 94

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 29 | 51 | 11 | 1 | 0 |
| 2.13% | 30.85% | 54.26% | 11.70% | 1.06% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.21

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18.75% | 31.25% | 43.75% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.63

Table 32

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 44 Level Elem Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 7 T= 110

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 20 | 22 | 18 | 10 | 29 |
| 10.00% | 18.18% | 20.00% | 16.36% | 9.09% | 26.36% |

Average = 3.25

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 8 T= 123

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52 | 36 | 23 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 42.28% | 29.27% | 18.70% | 0.81% | 4.07% | 4.88% |

Average = 4.90

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 14

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 64.29% | 21.43% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.50

Table 33

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 47 Level Elem Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 8 T= 122

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | 54 | 27 | 13 | 2 | 2 |
| 19.67% | 44.26% | 22.13% | 10.66% | 1.64% | 1.64% |

Average = 4.65

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 62

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 62.90% | 32.26% | 3.23% | 0.00% | 1.61% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.55

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.75

Table 34

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 33 Level Elem Cycle Year 5

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 8 T= 128

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45 | 52 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 35.16% | 40.63% | 21.09% | 2.34% | 0.00% | 0.78% |

Average = 5.06

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 79

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 67 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 84.81% | 11.39% | 2.53% | 1.27% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.80

**Building Administrator**

N= T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 87.50% | 0.00% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.75

Table 35

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 34 Level Elem Cycle Year 5

Group All

Questionaire Items . 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 6 T= 94

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38 | 15 | 30 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| 40.43% | 15.96% | 31.91% | 9.57% | 2.13% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.83

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 48.44% | 28.13% | 23.44% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.25

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 6.00

Table 36

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 70 Level Mid Schl Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 30 T= 474

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 146 | 164 | 117 | 21 | 12 | 14 |
| 30.80% | 34.60% | 24.68% | 4.43% | 2.53% | 2.95% |

Average = 4.78

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 9 T= 143

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 86 | 47 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 60.14% | 32.87% | 5.59% | 1.40% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.52

**Building Administrator**

N= 2 T= 32

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 81.25% | 15.63% | 3.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.78

Table 37

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 71 Level Mid Schl Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 29 T= 460

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 85 | 68 | 88 | 79 | 28 | 112 |
| 18.48% | 14.78% | 19.13% | 17.17% | 6.09% | 24.35% |

Average = 3.49

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 80

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | 22 | 13 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| 31.25% | 27.50% | 16.25% | 5.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% |

Average = 4.35

**Building Administrator**

N= 4 T= 60

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 23 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 31.67% | 38.33% | 23.33% | 6.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.95

Table 38

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 50 Level Mid Schl Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 40 T= 637

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 274 | 295 | 63 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 43.01% | 46.31% | 9.89% | 0.78% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.32

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 80

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42 | 35 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 52.50% | 43.75% | 2.50% | 1.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.48

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 6.00

Table 39

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 59 Level Mid Schl Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 20 T= 316

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 47 | 109 | 102 | 30 | 9 | 19 |
| 14.87% | 34.49% | 32.28% | 9.49% | 2.85% | 6.01% |

Average = 4.31

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 80

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | 33 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 33.75% | 41.25% | 21.25% | 2.50% | 0.00% | 1.25% |

Average = 5.03

**Building Administrator**

N= 2 T= 32

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 40.63% | 53.13% | 3.13% | 3.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.31

Table 40

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 46 Level Mid Schl Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 30 T= 476

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 163 | 141 | 88 | 31 | 27 | 26 |
| 34.24% | 29.62% | 18.49% | 6.51% | 5.67% | 5.46% |

Average = 4.64

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 43.75% | 43.75% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.31

Table 41

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 69 Level High Schl Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 31 T= 490

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 101 | 108 | 138 | 45 | 38 | 60 |
| 20.61% | 22.04% | 28.16% | 9.18% | 7.76% | 12.24% |

Average = 4.02

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 1 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 50.00% | 35.94% | 10.94% | 3.13% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.33

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 16

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.75% | 0.00% | 25.00% | 6.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.31

Table 42

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 48 Level High Schl Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionaire Items 1-16

**Teachers**

N= 18 T= 282

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 60 | 91 | 104 | 25 | 1 | 1 |
| 21.28% | 32.27% | 36.88% | 8.87% | 0.35% | 0.35% |

Average = 4.64

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 64

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 53.13% | 18.75% | 20.31% | 6.25% | 1.56% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.16

**Building Administrator**

N= 3 T= 47

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.89% | 46.81% | 38.30% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.77

# STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA
## QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15

### ALL POSITIONS, ALL GROUPS, ALL YEARS (TABLE 43)

This table shows data totaled from responses to all questionnaires. As with data collected for questionnaire items 1-16, the average response was highest for building administrators, followed by building leadership team members, and then teachers. A table of these averages with a scale of relative average levels of agreement (out of a possible 6.00) shows the following:

| POSITION | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Building Admin | 34 | 5.15 | Moderately Agree |
| BLT Members | 126 | 4.91 | Moderately Agree |
| Teachers | 436 | 4.49 | Moderately Agree |
| Total | 596 | 4.49 | Moderately Agree |

(The data listed under Total reflects that the number of teachers in the study was much larger than BLT membership or building administrator numbers. As a result, the total data is skewed in the direction of the teacher data).

Looking at data in the "Agree" category in Table 43, one can see that Building Administrators (40.69%) and BLT members (39.16%) had similar levels of perception concerning the impact on student achievement. Teachers had a lower number of responses in this category at 24.43%. In table form the data looks like this:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Bldg. Admin. | 34 | 40.69 |
| BLT Members | 126 | 39.16 |
| Teachers | 436 | 24.43 |
| Total | 596 | 28.50 |

If the percent who responded in the "Disagree" category is used in a similar table, the results would look like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Bldg. Admin. | 34 | 0.00 |
| BLT Members | 126 | 3.85 |
| Teachers | 436 | 10.26 |
| Total | 596 | 8.31 |

Finally, combining all responses that show agreement (Agree, Moderately Agree, and Slightly Agree) and all the responses that show disagreement (Disagree, Moderately Disagree, and Slightly Disagree) into two categories, a table of combined categories shows:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| POSITION | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bldg. Admin | 34 | 97.83 | 2.17 |
| BLT Members | 126 | 89.97 | 10.03 |
| Teachers | 436 | 77.68 | 22.32 |
| Total | 596 | 81.44 | 18.56 |

A review of data from all four tables shows that administrators have the highest level of perception among these three groups in regards to the impact of their school improvement projects on student achievement. BLT members have somewhat similar perceptions to those of administrators with teacher perceptions significantly lower than both groups.

Table 43

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None Level All Cycle Year All

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 436 T= 2943

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 719 | 854 | 713 | 254 | 101 | 302 |
| 24.43% | 29.02% | 24.23% | 8.63% | 3.43% | 10.26% |

Average = 4.32

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 126 T= 858

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 336 | 270 | 166 | 41 | 12 | 33 |
| 39.16% | 31.47% | 19.35% | 4.78% | 1.40% | 3.85% |

Average = 4.91

**Building Administrator**

N= 34 T= 231

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 94 | 84 | 48 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 40.69% | 36.36% | 20.78% | 1.73% | 0.43% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.15

**Total**

N= 596 T= 4032

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1149 | 1208 | 927 | 299 | 114 | 335 |
| 28.50% | 29.96% | 22.99% | 7.42% | 2.83% | 8.31% |

Average = 4.49

All Teachers (Table 44)

Data concerning teacher responses is categorized by elementary, middle school, and high school, and is totaled for all three groups. A table of relative average levels of agreement for teachers shows:

| POSITION | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 4.29 | Moderately Agree |
| Middle School | 149 | 4.42 | Moderately Agree |
| High School | 49 | 4.11 | Slightly Agree |
| Total | 436 | 4.32 | Moderately Agree |

The data for "Agree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) are as follows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 26.54 |
| Middle School | 149 | 24.15 |
| High School | 49 | 15.43 |
| High School | 436 | 24.43 |

A table showing "Disagree" responses for all teachers look like this:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 11.94 |
| Middle School | 149 | 8.44 |
| High School | 49 | 8.01 |
| Total | 436 | 10.21 |

The combination of all levels of Agree and Disagree shows the following:

## Combined Levels of Agree and Combined Levels of Disagree

| POSITION | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 238 | 76.57 | 23.43 |
| Middle School | 149 | 79.73 | 20.27 |
| High School | 49 | 76.56 | 23.44 |
| Total | 436 | 77.58 | 22.32 |

A study of data from these tables indicates that teachers from all three levels have similar perceptions about the impact of their school improvement projects on student achievement. Similar percentages appear for all three levels with the exception of lower levels of maximum agreeent for high school teachers.

Table 44

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None  Level All  Cycle Year All

Group Teachers

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Elementary**

N= 238  T= 1575

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 418 | 413 | 375 | 134 | 47 | 188 |
| 26.54% | 26.22% | 23.81% | 8.51% | 2.98% | 11.94% |

Average = 4.29

**Middle School**

N= 149  T= 1031

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 249 | 357 | 216 | 86 | 36 | 87 |
| 24.15% | 34.63% | 20.95% | 8.34% | 3.49% | 8.44% |

Average = 4.42

**High School**

N= 49  T= 337

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52 | 84 | 122 | 34 | 18 | 27 |
| 15.43% | 24.93% | 36.20% | 10.09% | 5.34% | 8.01% |

Average = 4.11

**Total**

N= 436  T= 2943

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 719 | 854 | 713 | 254 | 101 | 302 |
| 24.43% | 29.02% | 24.23% | 8.63% | 3.43% | 10.26% |

Average = 4.32

## All BLT Members (Table 45)

Data concerning all BLT members is categorized by elementary, middle school, and high school, and is totaled for all three groups. A table of relative average levels of agreement for BLT members shows the following:

| POSITION | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 4.89 | Moderately Agree |
| Middle School | 24 | 4.98 | Moderately Agree |
| High School | 8 | 4.84 | Moderately Agree |
| Total | 126 | 4.91 | Moderately Agree |

(Note: the large number of elementary BLT members compared with high school members will skew all Total data in the direction of the elementary responses).

The data for "Agree" responses for all three categories (in percentages) are as follows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 40.47 |
| Middle School | 24 | 38.32 |
| High School | 8 | 26.79 |
| Total | 126 | 39.16 |

A table showing "Disagree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) looks like this:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 4.25 |
| Middle School | 24 | 3.59 |
| High School | 8 | 0.00 |
| Total | 126 | 3.85 |

The combination of all levels of Agree and Disagree shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| POSITION | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 94 | 89.61 | 10.39 |
| Middle School | 24 | 91.02 | 8.98 |
| High School | 8 | 91.07 | 8.93 |
| Total | 126 | 89.97 | 10.03 |

A study of data from these four tables indicates that all levels had similar perceptios in terms of overall agreement and disagreement with impact on student achievement. While maximum agreement and disagreement data was different for high school than it was for elementary and middle school, the overall data shows a high degree of similarity.

Table 45

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None | Level All | Cycle Year All

Group BLT

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Elementary**

N= 94 T= 635

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 257 | 181 | 131 | 32 | 7 | 27 |
| 40.47% | 28.50% | 20.63% | 5.04% | 1.10% | 4.25% |

Average = 4.89

**Middle School**

N= 24 T= 167

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 64 | 67 | 21 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38.32% | 40.12% | 12.57% | 2.40% | 2.99% | 3.59% |

Average = 4.98

**High School**

N= 8 T= 56

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 22 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.79% | 39.29% | 25.00% | 8.93% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.84

**Total**

N= 126 T= 858

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 336 | 270 | 166 | 41 | 12 | 33 |
| 39.16% | 31.47% | 19.35% | 4.78% | 1.40% | 3.85% |

Average = 4.91

## All Building Administrators (Table 46)

Table 46 shows data for all elementary, middle school, and high school administrators. In most cases surveys returned were completed by the building principal. In larger buildings responses were received from assistant principals as well. The following is a table of relative average levels of agreement for this group:

| POSITION | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 5.25 | Agree |
| Middle School | 10 | 5.06 | Moderately Agree |
| High School | 4 | 4.85 | Moderately Agree |
| Total | 34 | 5.15 | Moderately Agree |

The data for "Agree" responses for all building administrators (in percentages) are as follows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 47.10 |
| Middle School | 10 | 33.33 |
| High School | 4 | 25.93 |
| Total | 34 | 40.69 |

A table showing "Disagree" responses for all three groups (in percentages) shows:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| POSITION | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 0.00 |
| Middle School | 10 | 0.00 |
| High School | 4 | 0.00 |
| Total | 34 | 0.00 |

The combination of all levels of Agree and Disagree shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| POSITION | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 20 | 97.83 | 2.17 |
| Middle School | 10 | 96.97 | 3.03 |
| High School | 4 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 34 | 97.84 | 2.16 |

Administrators in all three groups have similar and very high overall agreement on the impact of school improvement projects on student achievement. Average levels of agreement and maximum levels of agreement are higher for elementary than for middle school and high school administrators.

Table 46

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None | Level All | Cycle Year All

Group Bldg. Admin.

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Elementary**

N= 20 T= 138

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 65 | 47 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 47.10% | 34.06% | 16.67% | 1.45% | 0.72% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.25

**Middle School**

N= 10 T= 66

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | 28 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 33.33% | 42.42% | 21.21% | 3.03% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.06

**High School**

N= 4 T= 27

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.93% | 33.33% | 40.74% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.85

**Total**

N= 34 T= 231

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 94 | 84 | 48 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 40.69% | 36.36% | 20.78% | 1.73% | 0.43% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.15

## All Teachers, Years in C-SIP Cycle (Tables 47, 48, 49)

### Elementary Teachers (Table 47)

This table shows data from elementary teachers in cycle years one (three schools), two (four schools), three (ten schools), four (three schools), and five (two schools).

A table of relative average levels of agreement shows:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 4.05 | Slightly Agree |
| 2 | 49 | 4.76 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 124 | 4.11 | Slightly Agree |
| 4 | 20 | 4.02 | Slightly Agree |
| 5 | 14 | 5.09 | Moderately Agree |
| Total | 238 | 4.29 | Moderately Agree |

A table showing "Agree" responses for all teachers (in percentages) looks like this:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 25.39 |
| 2 | 49 | 34.55 |
| 3 | 124 | 24.97 |
| 4 | 20 | 9.49 |
| 5 | 14 | 37.62 |
| TOTAL | 238 | 26.54 |

A total of "Disagree" responses for all elementary teachers (in percentages) shows:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 18.65 |
| 2 | 49 | 4.24 |
| 3 | 124 | 15.18 |
| 4 | 20 | 10.22 |
| 5 | 14 | 0.00 |
| Total | 238 | 11.94 |

A table showing the combinations of all levels of Agree and Disagree for elementary teachers shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 69.43 | 30.57 |
| 2 | 49 | 86.67 | 13.33 |
| 3 | 124 | 72.94 | 27.06 |
| 4 | 20 | 68.61 | 31.39 |
| 5 | 14 | 98.02 | 1.98 |
| Total | 238 | 76.57 | 23.43 |

Summarizing overall data from these four tables shows teachers in years two and five had significantly higher perceptions of the impact on school achievement than the other three years. However, teachers in year four had a significantly lower level of agreement than teachers in other years. Also, teachers in years one, three and four had significantly higher levels of disagreement.

Table 47

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Elem
Cycle Year All
Group Teachers
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01

N= 31 T= 193

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 49 | 49 | 36 | 16 | 7 | 36 |
| 25.39% | 25.39% | 18.65% | 8.29% | 3.63% | 18.65% |

Average = 4.05

Year 02

N= 49 T= 330

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 114 | 100 | 72 | 26 | 4 | 14 |
| 34.55% | 30.30% | 21.82% | 7.88% | 1.21% | 4.24% |

Average = 4.76

Year 03

N= 124 T= 817

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 204 | 179 | 213 | 65 | 32 | 124 |
| 24.97% | 21.91% | 26.07% | 7.96% | 3.92% | 15.18% |

Average = 4.11

Year 04

N= 20 T= 137

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 52 | 29 | 25 | 4 | 14 |
| 9.49% | 37.96% | 21.17% | 18.25% | 2.92% | 10.22% |

Average = 4.02

Year 05

N= 14 T= 101

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38 | 36 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 37.62% | 35.64% | 24.75% | 1.98% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.09

Total

N= 238 T= 1575

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 418 | 413 | 375 | 134 | 47 | 188 |
| 26.54% | 26.22% | 23.81% | 8.51% | 2.98% | 11.94% |

Average = 4.29

## Middle School Teachers (Table 48)

This table shows data from middle schools in cycle years one (two schools), three (two schools), and four (one school). (There were no schools in cycle years two and five). A table of relative average levels of agreement shows:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 3.90 | Slightly Agree |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 60 | 4.91 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | 30 | 4.46 | Moderately Agree |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 149 | 4.42 | Moderately Agree |

The table of "Agree" responses for all teachers (in percentages) shows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 16.79 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 60 | 29.98 |
| 4 | 30 | 26.79 |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 149 | 24.15 |

The table of "Disagree" responses for middle school teachers (in percentages) looks like this:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 15.80 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 60 | 1.92 |
| 4 | 30 | 7.18 |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 149 | 8.44 |

The table of combined levels of the Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 59 | 66.67 | 33.33 |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 60 | 92.80 | 7.20 |
| 4 | 30 | 78.95 | 21.05 |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 149 | 79.73 | 20.27 |

This data suggests that schools in cycle year three had significantly higher perceptions of agreement that their C-SIP projects had an impact on student achievement. About the same difference in perception existed between cycle year four and cycle year one schools. While the relative levels of maximum agreement were similar for years three and four there was a significantly difference in their levels of disagreement.

This data suggests that school improvement may have more impact on student achievement in schools where C-SIP has been in use for a while than on schools just beginning their use of the process.

One should be careful to make generalizations about this data based on the limited number of schools in each cycle year.

Table 48

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Mid Schl
Cycle Year All
Group Teachers
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01
N= 59 T= 405

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 68 | 104 | 98 | 52 | 19 | 64 |
| 16.79% | 25.68% | 24.20% | 12.84% | 4.69% | 15.80% |

Average = 3.90

Year 02
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 60 T= 417

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 125 | 183 | 79 | 16 | 6 | 8 |
| 29.98% | 43.88% | 18.94% | 3.84% | 1.44% | 1.92% |

Average = 4.91

Year 04
N= 30 T= 209

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 56 | 70 | 39 | 18 | 11 | 15 |
| 26.79% | 33.49% | 18.66% | 8.61% | 5.26% | 7.18% |

Average = 4.46

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 149 T= 1031

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 249 | 357 | 216 | 86 | 36 | 87 |
| 24.15% | 34.63% | 20.95% | 8.34% | 3.49% | 8.44% |

Average = 4.42

## HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS (TABLE 49)

Table 49 shows data collected from the two high schools which participated in C-SIP during the 1988-89 school year. One school was in cycle year one and the other in cycle year three. The table of relative average levels of agreement looks like this:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 3.84 | Slightly Agree |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 4.58 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 49 | 4.11 | Slightly Agree |

A table of relative levels of maximum agreement shows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 14.02 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 17.89 |
| 4 | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 49 | 15.43 |

A table of relative levels of maximum disagreement shows:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 12.15 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 0.81 |
| 4 | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 49 | 8.01 |

This table of combined levels of all Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 31 | 68.23 | 31.77 |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 18 | 91.06 | 8.94 |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 49 | 76.56 | 23.44 |

While relative levels of maximum agreement are similar for both schools, the other data suggests that teachers in the cycle year three school feel the school improvement plan had a more significant impact on student achievement than teachers in the cycle year one school. More teachers agreed and fewer disagreed in this school. This may suggest that as high schools participate longer in C-SIP, teachers may feel that these plans have more impact on student achievement. One should be careful about drawing conclusions from this limited sample, however.

Table 49

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level High Schl
Cycle Year All
Group Teachers
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01
N= 31 T= 214

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 44 | 72 | 24 | 18 | 26 |
| 14.02% | 20.56% | 33.64% | 11.21% | 8.41% | 12.15% |

Average = 3.84

Year 02
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 18 T= 123

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | 40 | 50 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 17.89% | 32.52% | 40.65% | 8.13% | 0.00% | 0.81% |

Average = 4.58

Year 04
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 49 T= 337

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52 | 84 | 122 | 34 | 18 | 27 |
| 15.43% | 24.93% | 36.20% | 10.09% | 5.34% | 8.01% |

Average = 4.11

## ALL BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAMS MEMBERS, YEARS IN C-SIP CYCLE (TABLES 50, 51, 52)

### Elementary BLT Members (Table 50)

Table 50 contains data from all staff persons who were members of building leadership teams. Elementary schools participated in all cycle years from year one to year five. The following is a table of relative average levels of agreement for this group:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 4.84 | Moderately Agree |
| 2 | 16 | 5.07 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 37 | 4.77 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | 18 | 4.66 | Moderately Agree |
| 5 | 9 | 5.63 | Agree |
| Total | 94 | 4.89 | Moderately Agree |

A table showing "Agree" responses for all elementary BLT members (in percentages) shows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 28.26 |
| 2 | 16 | 52.38 |
| 3 | 37 | 39.06 |
| 4 | 18 | 26.05 |
| 5 | 9 | 71.43 |
| Total | 94 | 40.47 |

A table of "Disagree" responses for this group (in percentages) looks like this:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 1.09 |
| 2 | 16 | 4.76 |
| 3 | 37 | 7.03 |
| 4 | 18 | 2.52 |
| 5 | 9 | 0.00 |
| Total | 94 | 4.25 |

A table showing the combination of all levels of Agree and all levels of Disagree shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 92.39 | 7.61 |
| 2 | 16 | 90.48 | 9.52 |
| 3 | 37 | 85.55 | 14.45 |
| 4 | 18 | 89.92 | 10.08 |
| 5 | 9 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 94 | 89.61 | 10.39 |

Data from these tables shows a generally high level of agreement among elementary BLT members that school improvement plans this year had an impact on student achievement. That impact was perceived second highest by BLT members in cycle year one followed by a slight bottoming out in year three and rising again to the highest impact in year five.

Table 50

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Elem
Group BLT
Cycle Year All
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01

N= 14 T= 92

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | 34 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| 28.26% | 36.96% | 27.17% | 6.52% | 0.00% | 1.09% |

Average = 4.84

Year 02

N= 16 T= 105

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 55 | 22 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 52.38% | 20.95% | 17.14% | 4.76% | 0.00% | 4.76% |

Average = 5.07

Year 03

N= 37 T= 256

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | 73 | 46 | 17 | 2 | 18 |
| 39.06% | 28.52% | 17.97% | 6.64% | 0.78% | 7.03% |

Average = 4.77

Year 04

N= 18 T= 119

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | 39 | 37 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 26.05% | 32.77% | 31.09% | 3.36% | 4.20% | 2.52% |

Average = 4.66

Year 05

N= 9 T= 63

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71.43% | 20.63% | 7.94% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.63

Total

N= 94 T= 635

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 257 | 181 | 131 | 32 | 7 | 27 |
| 40.47% | 28.50% | 20.63% | 5.04% | 1.10% | 4.25% |

Average = 4.89

## Middle School BLT Members (Table 51)

Table 51 shows data collected from middle school building leadership team members. This data comes from two cycle year one schools and two cycle year three schools. (The BLT members from the one cycle year four school did not turn in questionnaires). The following table shows the relative average levels of agreement for this group:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 4.93 | Moderately Agree |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 10 | 5.03 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 24 | 4.98 | Moderately Agree |

A table of relative levels of maximum agreement gives the following information:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 42.27 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 10 | 32.86 |
| 4 | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 24 | 38.32 |

The table of relative levels of maximum disagreement looks like this:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 5.15 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 10 | 1.43 |
| 4 | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 24 | 3.59 |

The table of combined levels of all Agree and all Disagree categories for this group shows the following:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 14 | 87.64 | 12.36 |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 10 | 95.71 | 4.29 |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 24 | 91.02 | 8.98 |

While the date seems to indicate that BLT members in the year three schools have a higher overall perception of the impact on student achievement, the year one school members have a higher percent of maximum agreement. This data and the small sample size make judgements about this data inconclusive.

Table 51

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Mid Schl
Cycle Year All
Group BLT
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01
N= 14 T= 97

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41 | 35 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 42.27% | 36.08% | 9.28% | 2.06% | 5.15% | 5.15% |

Average = 4.93

Year 02
N= T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 10 T= 70

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | 32 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 32.86% | 45.71% | 17.14% | 2.86% | 0.00% | 1.43% |

Average = 5.04

Year 04
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 24 T= 167

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 64 | 67 | 21 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 38.32% | 40.12% | 12.57% | 2.40% | 2.99% | 3.59% |

Average = 4.98

## High School BLT Members (Table 52)

Two high schools participated in this year's C-SIP program, one in cycle year one and one in cycle year three.

The relative average level of agreement for these two groups is illustrated in the following table:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 4.79 | Moderately Agree |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 4 | 4.89 | Moderately Agree |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 8 | 4.84 | Moderately Agree |

The table of relative levels of maximum agreement looks like this:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 17.86 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 4 | 35.71 |
| 4 | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 8 | 26.78 |

The table of relative levels of maximum disagreement shows the following:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 0.00 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 4 | 0.00 |
| 4 | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 8 | 0.00 |

The table of combined levels of all Agree and Disagree categories for this group shows the following results:

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 92.86 | 7.14 |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 4 | 89.29 | 10.71 |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 8 | 91.07 | 8.93 |

The limited amount of data available prevents making generalizations about the group or commenting on any trends. While the cycle year three school has a higher percentage of maximum agreement, both schools have similar data in all other areas.

Table 52

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code All Level High Schl Cycle Year All
Group
Questionaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01
N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 17.86% | 50.00% | 25.00% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.79

Year 02
N= 4 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | | | | | |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 35.71% | 28.57% | 25.00% | 10.71% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.89

Year 04
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = #DIV/0!

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 8 T= 56

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 22 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.79% | 39.29% | 25.00% | 8.93% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.84

## All Building Administrators, Years in C-SIP Cycle (Tables 53, 54, 55)

### Elementary Administrators (Table 53)

Table 53 contains data collected from all elementary building administrators. As there is a maximum of one administrator survey per building, it is probable that these responses are from principals. Elementary schools were participating in all cycle years from one to five. The following is a table of relative average levels of agreement for these administrators:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 5.19 | Moderately Agree |
| 2 | 4 | 5.04 | Moderately Agree |
| 3 | 8 | 5.25 | Agree |
| 4 | 3 | 5.21 | Moderately Agree |
| 5 | 2 | 5.86 | Agree |
| Total | 20 | 5.25 | Agree |

The table of "Agree" responses for all elementary administrators (in percentages) shows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 28.57 |
| 2 | 4 | 35.71 |
| 3 | 8 | 51.79 |
| 4 | 3 | 36.84 |
| 5 | 2 | 92.86 |
| Total | 20 | 47.10 |

The table of "Disagree" responses for this group (in percentages) is as follows:

RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.00 |
| 3 | 8 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 2 | 0.00 |
| Total | 20 | 0.00 |

The following table shows the combination of all levels of Agree and all levels of Disagree for elementary administrators:

COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 4 | 96.43 | 3.57 |
| 3 | 8 | 96.42 | 3.58 |
| 4 | 3 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 2 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 20 | 97.83 | 2.17 |

The data from these tables show similar perceptions about the impact of individual improvement programs on student achievement in all five cycle years. While there is a scattering in the relative levels of maximum agreement, the other tables do not support this variation. Support seems to increase slightly as schools participate longer in C-SIP and is very strong across all five years.

Table 53

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Elem
Group Bldg Admin
Cycle Year All
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01

N= 3 T= 21

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.57% | 61.90% | 9.52% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.19

Year 02

N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 35.71% | 35.71% | 25.00% | 3.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.04

Year 03

N= 8 T= 56

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29 | 15 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 51.79% | 26.79% | 17.86% | 1.79% | 1.79% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.25

Year 04

N= 3 T= 19

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36.84% | 47.37% | 15.79% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.21

Year 05

N= 2 T= 14

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 92.86% | 0.00% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.86

Total

N= 20 T= 138

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 65 | 47 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 47.10% | 34.06% | 16.67% | 1.45% | 0.72% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.25

## Middle School Administrators (Table 54)

Table 54 shows data concerning middle school administrators participating in C-SIP. Ten administrators responded from the five schools. The relative levels of agreement for this group were:

| YEAR | N | AVERAGE | SUBJECTIVE CATEGORY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 4.87 | Moderately Agree |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 5.48 | Agree |
| 4 | 1 | 4.86 | Moderately Agree |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 10 | 5.06 | Moderately Agree |

The table of levels of maximum agreement shows:

### RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM AGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT AGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 26.32 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 52.38 |
| 4 | 1 | 14.29 |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 10 | 33.33 |

A table for levels of maximum disagreement shows the following information:

## RELATIVE LEVELS OF MAXIMUM DISAGREEMENT

| YEAR | N | PERCENT DISAGREE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 0.00 |
| 2 | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 1 | 0.00 |
| 5 | --- | --- |
| Total | 10 | 0.00 |

## COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 94.74 | 5.26 |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | 1 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 10 | 96.97 | 3.03 |

Despite the variation of percentages in the maximum agreement table, the data for this group seems to indicate that middle school administrators strongly perceive that school improvement programs do have a positive impact on student achievement.

Table 54

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level Midl Schl
Cycle Year All
Group Bldg Admin
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01
N= 6 T= 38

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 15 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.32% | 39.47% | 28.95% | 5.26% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.87

Year 02
N= T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03
N= 3 T= 21

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 52.38% | 42.86% | 4.76% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.48

Year 04
N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.29% | 57.14% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.86

Year 05
N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total
N= 10 T= 66

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | 28 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 33.33% | 42.42% | 21.21% | 3.03% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.06

## High School Administrators (Table 55)

The four administrators who completed surveys from the two participating high schools responded in the following ways:

- The average level of agreement for the year one school was 5.43 (Agree) and the year three school 4.65 (Moderately Agree).
- The levels of maximum agreement were 71.43% and 10.00%
- The levels of maximum disagreement were both 0.00%
- The table of combined levels of all Agree and Disagree categories for this group show, the following results:

### COMBINED LEVELS OF AGREE AND COMBINED LEVELS OF DISAGREE

| YEAR | N | TOTAL A, MA, SA CATEGORIES % | TOTAL D, MD, SD CATEGORIES % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 2 | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- |
| Total | 4 | 100.00 | 0.00 |

The limited number of high schools participating in C-SIP make trends and tendencies difficult to ascertain. It appears that administrators from both schools feel there is a significant impact on school achievement, however, the cycle year three school has a much lower percentage of maximum agreement than the year one school.

Table 55

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code None
Level High Schl
Cycle Year All
Group Bldg Admin
Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

Year 01

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71.43% | 0.00% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.43

Year 02

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 03

N= 3 T= 20

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10.00% | 45.00% | 45.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.65

Year 04

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Year 05

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Total

N= 4 T= 27

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.93% | 33.33% | 40.74% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.85

## ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Data for this analysis of the effect of C-SIP generated school improvement plans on student achievement has been gathered only from evaluation surveys. Information from any testing done at individual building sites has not been used. This data, then, represents the perceptions of these educators related to student achievement improvements.

This data shows that there is a high level of agreement about this impact by those surveyed. Looking at the responses in the "Agree" category of the surveys, 24% of teachers, 39% of building leadership team members, and 41% of building administrators marked this response. Aggregating the responses from all three "Agree" categories shows 78% of teachers, 90% of BLT members, and 98% building administrators stated they agree. This administrative group had the highest average level of agreement, the highest maximum level of agreement, the lowest level of maximum disagreement, and the highest combined level percentages. Building Leadership Team members generate similar data in all areas. Teacher data was significantly lower, nevertheless, almost four of five teachers responding stated that they at least somewhat agreed that their programs had an impact on student achievement. It is interesting to note that across the three levels of each group the data is quite similar, i.e., teacher data for elementary, middle school, and high school is similar. Likewise, data for the three BLT and Building Administrator levels is similar. This provides evidence that while there is a difference in perception between the groups there is little difference in perception among members of each group. This difference in perception between the three levels could be explained by the ownership issue discussed in the section analyzing data for questionnaire items 1-16.

A noteworthy contradiction of the data collected for these seven achievement items can be found in the responses to questionnaire item nineteen a. and b. In this item, participants were asked to respond in a narrative fashion about how they felt their school improvement project affected their school and themselves

personally. Despite the teachers' lower levels of agreement with the impact on student achievement, they mentioned improved student achievement and improved classroom instruction as benefits of C-SIP more often than either of the other two-groups in item nineteen. In item 19a, teachers mentioned improved classroom instruction twenty-four times and improved student achievement sixteen times. These were the fifth and ninth highest ranking number of responses for this group. BLT members mentioned improved student achievement fifteen times (ranked second). Building administrators, the group with the highest level of agreement, did not mention improved student achievement on even one survey. (Nearly every response in the teacher and BLT groups was from the elementary level). In item 19b, teachers mentioned improved classroom instruction forty-nine times and improved student achievement or some benefit to students thirty-two times (rank one and two of all responses). BLT members listed improved classroom instruction twenty-nine times (rank one) and improved student achievement six times (rank seven). Only one response was recorded for administrators about student achievement and none for improved classroom instruction. (Again, most of these responses were from the elementary level).

Also interesting to note was that despite the similarity in responses by elementary, middle school, and high school teachers on the forced-choiced items, few responses about student achievement or classroom instruction were recorded by secondary teachers in questionaire item nineteen. This was also true of secondary BLT members. Despite the administrators strong agreement with the student achievement questionnaire items, their comments in item nineteen did not support this agreement.

One possible explanation of this difference is that group members may be more likely to respond in an open-ended narrative by commenting on the item that has the greatest impact on their jobs. This could explain why teachers and BLT members (who are predominantly teachers) mention classroom instruction and student achievement more frequently. This could also explain why administrators mention interpersonal relations issues more

frequently. Also, unless a staff has picked a student achievement goal for their focus they may tend to target their comments on improvement to that goal area rather than improved student achievement even through improvement in that area is quite possibly the ultimate desired outcome of any school improvement program.

A comment should be made that the lowest level of agreement among teachers was in cycle year one schools. This was not true of BLT members or building administrators in year one schools. This could possibly be explained as an ownership issue, i.e., the longer one is involved in C-SIP or the greater investment you have in planning, the higher your level of agreement. While this comment represents a possible explanation, other data is inconsistent on trends by year in the program.. It is most important to note the generally high levels of agreement among all groups and at all levels.

Finally, a note should be made about the impact on this data of two schools which responded very negatively to these questionnaire items. These two schools (one elementary, year three, and one middle school, year one) were previously mentioned in the analysis of items 1-16. From the surveys submitted by this elementary school, there were 70 Disagree (85% of their total) responses. The highest Disagree response for any other elementary was 35%. In cycle year three schools, 56% of the Disagree responses came from one of ten schools. For all elementarys, 37% of the total Disagree responses came from 1 of 22 schools. From the middle school, 61 Disagree responses came from this school and only three from the other cycle year one middle school. This 61 was 30% of the total responses for this school. 70% of the total Disagree responses in Table 48 were from one of five schools. These two schools had a marked impact on the total data.

# STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT ITEMS

# RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS

Table 56

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 66 Level Elem Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 13 T= 69

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 15 | 14 | 9 | 3 | 18 |
| 14.49% | 21.74% | 20.29% | 13.04% | 4.35% | 26.09% |

Average = 3.51

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 34

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.71% | 35.29% | 32.35% | 17.65% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.47

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.29% | 71.43% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.00

Table 57

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 67 Level Elem Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 7 T= 48

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 18 |
| 6.25% | 10.42% | 25.00% | 14.58% | 6.25% | 37.50% |

Average = 2.83

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 30

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 20.00% | 30.00% | 46.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 3.33% |

Average = 4.60

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.29% | 71.43% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.00

Table 58

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 68 Level Elem Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 11 T= 76

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 36 | 29 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 47.37% | 38.16% | 13.16% | 0.00% | 1.32% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.30

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 53.57% | 46.43% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.54

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 57.14% | 42.86% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.57

Table 59

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 62 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 19 T= 129

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 63 | 31 | 16 | 9 | 2 | 8 |
| 48.84% | 24.03% | 12.40% | 6.98% | 1.55% | 6.20% |

Average = 4.93

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 26

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 73.08% | 26.92% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.73

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.57% | 71.43% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.29

Table 60

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 63 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 12 T= 82

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 37 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 39.02% | 45.12% | 10.98% | 3.66% | 0.00% | 1.22% |

Average = 5.16

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 6 T= 42

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 61.90% | 21.43% | 11.90% | 4.76% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.40

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 85.71% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.86

Table 61

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 64 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 4 T= 27

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.93% | 25.93% | 48.15% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.78

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 23

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 39.13% | 17.39% | 21.74% | 8.70% | 0.00% | 13.04% |

Average = 4.48

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 28.57% | 71.43% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.29

Table 62

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 65 Level Elem Cycle Year 2

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 14 T= 91

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 25 | 34 | 14 | 2 | 4 |
| 13.19% | 27.47% | 37.36% | 15.38% | 2.20% | 4.40% |

Average = 4.21

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 2 T= 14

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7.14% | 14.29% | 57.14% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 14.29% |

Average = 3.79

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 8

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 37.50% | 25.00% | 25.00% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.88

Table 63

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 49 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 16 T= 101

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 17 | 31 | 24 | 7 | 17 |
| 4.95% | 16.83% | 30.69% | 23.76% | 6.93% | 16.83% |

Average = 3.39

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 1 T= 6

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 16.67% | 0.00% | 83.33% |

Average = 1.33

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 28.57% | 42.86% | 14.29% | 14.29% | 0.00% |

Average = 3.86

Table 64

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 51 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 6 T= 40

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 75.00% | 17.50% | 7.50% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.68

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 21

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 85.71% | 9.52% | 4.76% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.81

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71.43% | 14.29% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.57

Table 65

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 52 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 19 T= 116

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 21 | 52 | 11 | 8 | 11 |
| 11.21% | 18.10% | 44.83% | 9.48% | 6.90% | 9.48% |

Average = 3.89

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.00% | 53.57% | 21.43% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.04

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71.43% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.71

Table 66

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 53 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 14 T= 94

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | 29 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| 24.47% | 30.85% | 31.91% | 8.51% | 3.19% | 1.06% |

Average = 4.62

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 27

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 44.44% | 40.74% | 14.81% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.30

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 42.86% | 57.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.43

Table 67

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 54 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 15 T= 103

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 17 | 44 | 10 | 6 | 11 |
| 14.56% | 16.50% | 42.72% | 9.71% | 5.83% | 10.68% |

Average = 3.92

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 6 T= 42

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 11 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| 19.05% | 26.19% | 38.10% | 11.90% | 0.00% | 4.76% |

Average = 4.38

**Building Administrator**

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Table 68

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 55 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 17 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.57% | 60.71% | 28.57% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.61

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 35

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 14 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 5.71% | 40.00% | 34.29% | 5.71% | 5.71% | 8.57% |

Average = 4.09

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 42.86% | 57.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.43

Table 69

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 57 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 25 T= 176

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73 | 53 | 36 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 41.48% | 30.11% | 20.45% | 2.27% | 1.14% | 4.55% |

Average = 4.95

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 35

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.43% | 48.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.51

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 6.00

Table 70

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 58 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 9 T= 57

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 77.19% | 10.53% | 3.51% | 1.75% | 5.26% | 1.75% |

Average = 5.47

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 20

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 80.00% | 5.00% | 10.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 5.00% |

Average = 5.50

**Building Administrator**

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

Table 71

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 60 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 3 T= 20

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 0.00% | 50.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 5.00% | 25.00% |

Average = 3.65

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 21

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 90.48% | 9.52% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.90

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 6.00

Table 72

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 61 Level Elem Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 13 T= 82

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 70 |
| 0.00% | 2.44% | 3.66% | 6.10% | 2.44% | 85.37% |

Average = 1.35

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 3 T= 21

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 7 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 23.81% | 42.86% | 0.00% | 33.33% |

Average = 2.57

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.57% | 42.86% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.00

Table 73

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 42 Level Elem Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 5 T= 33

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 9.09% | 36.36% | 36.36% | 18.18% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.36

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 6 T=.41

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 12 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.44% | 29.27% | 60.98% | 7.32% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.27

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.29% | 57.14% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.86

Table 74

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 44 Level Elem Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 7 T= 48

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 14 |
| 4.17% | 20.83% | 16.67% | 22.92% | 6.25% | 29.17% |

Average = 3.06

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 8 T= 50

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | 17 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 24.00% | 34.00% | 24.00% | 2.00% | 10.00% | 6.00% |

Average = 4.42

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 5

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40.00% | 40.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.20

Table 75

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 47 Level Elem Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 8 T= 56

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 30 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| 14.29% | 53.57% | 16.07% | 14.29% | 1.79% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.64

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 64.29% | 35.71% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.64

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 57.14% | 42.86% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.57

Table 76

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 33 Level Elem Cycle Year 5

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 8 T= 56

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41.07% | 42.86% | 16.07% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.25

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 34

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 88.24% | 11.76% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.88

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 85.71% | 0.00% | 14.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.71

Table 77

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 34 Level Elem Cycle Year 5

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 6 T= 42

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 9 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 35.71% | 21.43% | 38.10% | 4.76% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.88

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 29

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.72% | 31.03% | 17.24% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.34

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 6.00

Table 78

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 70 Level Midl Schl Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 30 T= 205

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | 78 | 56 | 10 | 8 | 3 |
| 24.39% | 38.05% | 27.32% | 4.88% | 3.90% | 1.46% |

Average = 4.70

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 9 T= 62

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 54.84% | 40.32% | 4.84% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.50

**Building Administrator**

N= 2 T= 14

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 57.14% | 35.71% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.50

Table 79

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 71 Level Midl Schl Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 29 T= 200

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 26 | 42 | 42 | 11 | 61 |
| 9.00% | 13.00% | 21.00% | 21.00% | 5.50% | 30.50% |

Average = 3.08

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 35

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 20.00% | 28.57% | 17.14% | 5.71% | 14.29% | 14.29% |

Average = 3.91

**Building Administrator**

N= 4 T= 24

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 8.33% | 41.67% | 41.67% | 8.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.50

Table 80

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 50 Level Midl Schl Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 40 T= 278

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 117 | 133 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 42.09% | 47.84% | 10.07% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.32

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 35

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.43% | 42.86% | 2.86% | 2.86% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.43

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 6.00

Table 81

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 59 Level Midl Schl Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 20 T= 139

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 50 | 51 | 16 | 6 | 8 |
| 5.76% | 35.97% | 36.69% | 11.51% | 4.32% | 5.76% |

Average = 4.10

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 5 T= 35

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 17 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 14.29% | 48.57% | 31.43% | 2.86% | 0.00% | 2.86% |

Average = 4.66

**Building Administrator**

N= 2 T= 14

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.57% | 64.29% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.21

Table 82

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 46 Level Midl Schl Cycle Year 4

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 30 T= 209

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 56 | 70 | 39 | 18 | 11 | 15 |
| 26.79% | 33.49% | 18.66% | 8.61% | 5.26% | 7.18% |

Average = 4.46

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 0 T= 0

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 0.00

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.29% | 57.14% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.86

Table 83

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 69 Level High Schl Cycle Year 1

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 31 T= 214

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 44 | 72 | 24 | 18 | 26 |
| 14.02% | 20.56% | 33.64% | 11.21% | 8.41% | 12.15% |

Average = 3.84

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 28.

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 17.86% | 50.00% | 25.00% | 7.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.79

**Building Administrator**

N= 1 T= 7

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 71.43% | 0.00% | 28.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 5.43

Table 84

**Collaborative School Improvement Process**
Wayne State University

School Code 48 Level High Schl Cycle Year 3

Group All

Questionnaire Items 6-7-8-9-10-14-15

**Teachers**

N= 18 T= 123

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22 | 40 | 50 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 17.89% | 32.52% | 40.65% | 8.13% | 0.00% | 0.81% |

Average = 4.58

**Building Leadership Team**

N= 4 T= 28

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 35.71% | 28.57% | 25.00% | 10.71% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.89

**Building Administrator**

N= 3 T= 20

| A | MA | SA | SD | MD | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10.00% | 45.00% | 45.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average = 4.65

# QUESTIONAIRE ITEMS 17, 18, 19

## QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #17

This questionnaire item asked for the perceptions of the school personnel about the six-stem C-SIP process. The item listed the six steps as a reminder, then asked them to write (in complete sentences) their assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of C-SIP and to write any of their suggestions for improving the process. Responses were as varied as the number of people who took time to write or list their perceptions of this process. Every response was recorded as it appeared on the survey or paraphrased to save the intend of the writer. These responses were tabulated by categorizing each under a heading. These headings were not predetermined, but instead emerged in the process of tabulation. Headings were added, changed, expanded, or consolidated as the tabulation progressed. Every response was recorded in some heading that best captured (in the option of the recorder) the essence of what the writer was trying to communicate. These results will be reported by group (Teachers, BLT members, and Building Administrators). No attempt was made to delineate data by elementary, middle school, high school, or by years participating in C-SIP unless some noteworthy responses were recorded.

### Item #17a

### "WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS OF THE SIX-STEP PROCESS?"

### TEACHERS

Of the 436 teacher surveys, 249 (57%) responded to this item and 187 (43%) did not. (39 "no responses" all came from the same middle school.) Many teachers who did respond listed more than one strength.

Responses, by number, to each of the six steps of the C-SIP process are as follows:

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | STEP 5 | STEP 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 65 | 53 | 42 | 40 | 28 | 17 |

Other responses were placed in categories as described in the introduction to this section. Those categories, with the number of people who listed each as a strength of the process, are as follows:

- The process (as a whole) is good (43)
- Helped us identify, set, and reach our goals, helped us focus (22)
- Staff involvement in process (14)
- Helped staff develop commitment to, ownership of plan (11)
- Improved staff communication (9)
- Staff worked together, were cohesive (8)
- Improved staff relations (7)
- Staff had input in decision-making (7)
- None (no strengths) (7)
- We didn't use the process (4)
- Process provides for ongoing evaluation, monitoring reassessment (3)
- Time is adequate (2)
- Aids in creative problem solving (1)

## BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

Of the 126 surveys returned from this group, 104 (83%) included responses to this item, 22 (17%) did not. Many members listed more than one strength.

Responses, by number, to each of the six steps of the C-SIP process are as follows:

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | STEP 5 | STEP 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | 38 | 24 | 25 | 11 | 9 |

Other responses include:

- Staff involvement in process (18)
- The process (as a whole) is good (13)
- Helped us identify, set, and reach our goals, helped us focus (12)
- Staff worked together, were cohesive (9)
- Helped staff develop commitment to ownership of plan (6)
- Improved staff communication (2)
- Funding was helpful (2)

One person listed each of the following strengths:

- Provides support for implementation of plan
- It's ongoing, not one shot
- The process is totally unacceptable
- The facilitator was helpful
- Adequate amount of time for planning
- Professional growth opportunities were provided

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

Of the 34 administrators who returned surveys, 29 (85%) responded to this item, five (15%) did not. Responses, by number, to each step of the C-SIP process are as follows:

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | STEP 5 | STEP 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3 |

Other responses were:

- Staff involvement in process (9)
- Gave directin to our school improvement efforts (6)
- Helped staff develop commitment to, ownership of plan (4)
- Staff worked together, were cohesive (4)

- The process (as a whole) is good (3)
- Process provides for ongoing evaluation, monitoring reassessment (2)
- Teacher take leadership roles (2)
- Improves communication (1)
- Facilitator was helpful (1)
- Process includes change factors (1)

Item #17h

"WHAT ARE THE WEAKNESSES OF THE SIX-STEP PROCESS?"

## TEACHERS

From the 436 teacher surveys, there were 171 (39%) who responded to this item. 265 (61%) did not respond. Of this number, 22 high school teachers did not respond, 93 middle school teachers (40 from one of the five buildings) did not respond, and no response was recorded for 150 elementary teachers.

Responses, by number, to each of the six steps of the C-SIP process are as follows:

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | STEP 5 | STEP 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 9 | 6 | 32 | 25 | 20 |

Other responses in order of the frequency are:

- Process too time consuming (19)
- Improve staff commitment to the plan (19)
- None (no weaknesses) (12)
- Poor follow through on various steps (8)
- Gather more staff input (7)
- Set better, more realistic goals, or provide more narrow focus for plan (4)
- Improve administrative support (3)
- Unaware of process, not being used (3)
- Too long to implement process (2)
- Poor communication (2)
- Not enough time to reach goal (2)
- Too long for staff to reach consensus (2)

Each of the following comments was written by one person:

- Improve communication between staff and administration
- Process too complicated
- More evaluation, monitoring reassessment during implementation
- Improve communication between staff, BLT
- Design of process is poor
- Students need to be part of the process

## BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

Seventy-one (56%) of the one hundred twenty six BLT surveys had responses to this item, fifty-five (44%) did not.

Responses for each C-SIP process step were as follows:

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | STEP 5 | STEP 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 8 | 1 | 13 | 15 | 8 |

Other responses found on these surveys are listed below:

- More time needed to implement plan (10) (Elem. only)
- Limit number of goals, narrow the focus (6)
- More staff involvement in the process (4)
- Need improved commitment to plan by staff (4)
- Allow more opportunity for mid-year adjustment, evaluation (3)
- None (no weaknesses) (3)
- Process explained more clearly (2)

Each of the following comments were written by one person:

- Administration unsupportive
- Process too complex
- Tie evaluation of plan to student outcomes
- Process needs to be more through

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATOR

Eighteen (53%) of building administrator surveys had a response written for this item. Sixteen surveys (47%) did not have a response.

Responses for each of the C-SIP process steps were as follows:

| STEP 1 | STEP 2 | STEP 3 | STEP 4 | STEP 5 | STEP 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |

Other comments listed in this item include:

- Plans difficult to review, modify during school year (3)
- Process needs to build more commitment from staff (3)
- Not enough time to develop, implement a good plan (3)
- None (no weaknesses) (2)
- Process too slow (1)
- Consensus building leads to common denominator, not most important goal (1)
- Process moves too quickly (1)
- Build in more staff involvement (1)
- Difficult to narrow goals (1)

## ITEM # 17c

## "WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR IMPROVEMENT?"

## TEACHERS

128 (29%) of the 436 surveys had responses to this item while 308 (71%) did not have suggestions for improving the process. Of the 308, 32 were high school teacher surveys, 111 middle schools (40 from one building), and 165 were elementary teacher surveys. Eleven teachers responded "None" (they have no suggestions for improvements).

Other responses were placed in categories as described in the introduction to this section. Those categories and the number of people who responded in each are as follows:

- More commitment from staff to plan (17)
- More staff involvement in discussions, decision making (10)
- More monitoring, reviewing, updating of plan during the year (10)
- More release time for staff (8)
- Improve communication (8)
- More time in Step 1 before making a commitment (6)
- Better focus, more realistic goals (5)
- More time needed (5)
- Improve administrative leadership (5)
- More help with implementation (3)
- More time for needs assessment (2)

One respondent listed each of these comments on his or her survey:

- Share leadership with staff
- Include students in the process
- Improve adoption phase
- Clarify role of building administrator
- Cancel the plan
- Broader focus
- Reach consensus for goal, not majority rule

## BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM

Fifty-one (40%) of the 126 BLT surveys had responses to this questionnaire item. Of the seventy-five (60%) that did not, fifty-four were from elementary BLT members. One person responded "None" (no improvements).

Other responses, in order of frequency mentioned,are:

- Better staff committed to plan (7)
- More monitoring, reviewing, updating of plan during year (6)
- More time for process, completion of each step (6)
- More planning, inservice release time for staff (4)
- More direction for facilitators (4)
- Improve needs assessment (4)
- Expand involvement on BLT (2)
- Set more realistic, manageable goals (2)

One person recorded each of these comments:

- More follow through on adoption
- More information on process in Step 1
- Shrink role of BLT
- More staff input
- Eliminate some steps

- More staff involvement in goal setting
- Include parents in process
- PRAYER

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

Sixteen (47%) of the 34 administrator surveys had a response recorded for this item while 18 (53%) had no response. One person listed "None" (no improvement suggested).

Other responses from the surveys include:

- Improve staff commitment throughout process (4)
- Improve monitoring, reviewing, updating of plan (3)
- Improve implementation (2)
- More time between awareness and commitment in Step 1 (2)
- Build more staff involvement (2)
- Extend WSU involvement, funding (2)
- Build more ownership in process (1)
- Narrow #, focus of goals (1)
- Improve Step 1

## QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #18

On the survey, this item reads:

**"To what degree do you believe the six-step process will continue in your building once the special funding comes to a close? I believe the six-step process will:**

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue |
|---|---|---|---|

**Comments:"**

(Participants were asked to circle one of the four items listed above, then comment if they desired.)

Results for this section were tallied for teachers, for building leadership team members, and for building administrators. No delineation of the data was done by the respondents placement in an elementary or secondary school.

The number of responses for each of the four categories was tallied and a percentage calculated for the number of responses for each group. Then a weighted average was calculated for each item. This average was determined by assigning each of the four responses a number (four for Definitely Continue, three for Probably Continue, two for Probably Not Continue, one for Definitely Not Continue and zero for No Response). This weighted number was multiplied by the number of responses in each category, all categories were then added together, and divided by the total number of responses to determine a weighted average. Responses in the comment section were also tallied.

## TEACHERS

Of the 436 teachers who responded to this survey, 383 responded to this particular item. Their responses in table form appear below:

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 112 | 182 | 71 | 18 | 53 |
| 25.68% | 41.74% | 16.28% | 4.13% | 12.16% |

Average= 2.67 (including "No Response" surveys)
= 3.01 (including "No Response" surveys)

## BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS

115 of the 126 BLT Members surveyed responded to this item in this way:

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 37 | 67 | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| 29.36% | 53.17% | 7.94% | 0.08 | 8.73% |

Average= 2.94 (including "No Response" Surveys)
= 3.22 (excluding "No Response" Surveys)

## QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #19

This questionnaire item asked participants to assess the impact their school improvement project has had on their school and on them personally. Like item # 17, the responses were as varied as the number of people who wrote them. These responses were recorded and tabulated in a similar fashion as used in item #17. Data will be reported in a similar fashion as well.

### Item #19a

"How do you feel about your school improvement project? How is it going and what differences is it making in your school?"

### TEACHERS

246 (56%) of the 436 teacher surveys had at least one response for this item. Many surveys had several comments. 190 surveys (86 elementary, 85 middle school (40 from one building), and 19 high school) did not include a response (44%). Positive categories and the number of responses for each are listed first as these were the majority of the comments. Negative categories are listed at the conclusion of this section.

Positive comments and categories are as follows:

- Project had positive impact on students (motivation, attitude, self-esteem, etc.) (38)
  (29 elementary, 8 middle school, 1 high school)
- Staff worked to identify, set goals, work to accomplish them (commitment) (26)
- Staff working together, cohesive (26)
- We made progress toward accomplishing our goal (25)
- Improved classroom instruction (20 elem. , 4 middle school) (24)
- Improved school climate (23)
- Plan, process had a positive impact on our building (23)
- Improved staff relations (19)

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

All 34 administrators responded to this survey item. The results are as follows:

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 52.94% | 41.18% | 5.88% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Average= 3.47

An investigation of this data seems to point to a fairly high level of optimism from these three groups about the continuation of this program after funding expires. Building administrators were most optimistic, followed by Building Leadership Team members, then teachers. We can further look at the pattern of these responses by joining data from both "continue" categories and both "not continue" categories. This shows that among the teachers, 67.42% thought the program had a chance to continue and 20.41% thought it probably would not (No Response 12.16%). Among BLT members, 82.53% thought it had a chance to continue and 8.02% thought it probably would not (No Response - 8.73%). Among building adminstrators, 94.12% were optimistic about continuing and 5.88% were not (No Response - 0.00%).

There were very few comments written from the 596 surveys. All of them spoke to their feelings that the program would continue because of the high level commitment of administration, teaching staff, and BLT members to the school or to school improvement in general or to the excellence of previous plans.

- Improved staff communication (16)
- Improved student achievement (16)
  (14 elem., 2 middle school)
- Increased staff input in decision-making (14)
- Release time helpful (4)
- Improved student, staff relations (3)
- Consultants were helpful (2)
- Student behavior improved (2)

The following items were mentioned by just one person:

- Know more about middle schoolers
- Exposure to current research
- Our involvement in C-SIP for several years is a plus
- Staff morale improved
- Improved staff, parent relations

Comments about the negative impact on C-SIP on school buildings include:

- Little or not change in building (15)
- Plan, progress not as good this year as other years (9)
- Need more release time (8)
- Poor follow though on decisions (5)
- More staff commitment needed to our plan (4)
- Need better administrative leadership (3)
- Took too much time to implement (3)
- Needed better communication (3)
- Unclear about our project (2)

- Morale needs improvement (2)
- Plan needs more focus (2)
- Process not helpful (2)
- Too much administrative direction (1)
- Needed more progress updates (1)
- Major problems not addressed (1)
- Difficult to evaluate effect (1)
- Inservice ineffective (1)
- Building problems prevented progress (1)

## BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM

76 percent of BLT surveys (96 of 126) had a response to this item. 24 percent (30) did not. Twenty-two of these were elementary.

Response categories and numbers were as follows:

- Staffing working together, cohesive (19)
- Improved student achievement (all elem.) (15)
- Staff identified, set goals, worked to accomplish (ownership) (12)
- Positive impact, changes in our school (11)
- Improved staff communication (10)
- Improved classroom instruction (8 elem., 1 middle school) (9)
- Increased staff involvement in decision-making (9)
- Improved student behavior (8)
- Better staff relations (6)
- Made good progress toward accomplishing our goal (6)
- Planning, workshop days were helpful (4)
* - Little or nothing changed (4)
* - Needed more staff commitment to goals (4)
- Improved staff morale (3)
- Some benefit for students (2)

One teacher listed each of the following comments on his or her questionnaire:

- Provided structure for school improvement
- Improved my attitude toward school improvement
- Provided a structure to approach problem solving
- Improved staff, administrator communication
- Raised awareness of research
- More materials for our building
- We could not solve our problems
- More aware of student needs

- Increased parent involvement
- Difficult to measure impact on student achievement
- We lost our focus
- Improved student interaction
- Goals visible to community

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

Of the 34 surveys returned for this group, 28 (82%) had a response to this item while six (18%) did not.

Responses from the administrators group were:

- Staff cohesion, working together (8)
- Positive effect or changes occurred in building (7)
- Staff ownership, commitment to plan (6)
- Improved staff relations (5)
- Improved school climate (4)
- Improved staff morale (4)
- Benefits, positive outcomes for students (3)
- Better staff communication (3)
- Improved curriculum, classroom instruction (3)
- Improved staff input in decision-making (2)

The following comments were mentioned by just one building administrator:

- Student behavior improved
- WSU facilitator helpful
- Teachers took a leadership role
- Improved staff, administrator communication
- We looked at educational research
- More staff insight into school problems
- Strategies for problem solving
- Empowering staff made me a better administrator
- Pulled strengths from staff
- Funds were helpful to my building

Item #19b

"What differences for you personnally can you sight that are a result of your school's participation in C-SIP?"

## TEACHERS

A fairly even number of teachers did and did not respond to this questionnaire item. 49 percent (213 of 436) of the surveys had a recorded response and 51 percent (223) had no response. Of this number, 18 were from high school teachers, 98 from middle school (39 from one building), and 107 from elementary teachers.

Responses, in order, are as follows:

- Improved my classroom instruction (49)
  (40 elem., 7 middle, 2 high school)
- Improved student achievement or some benefit to studen (32)
  (22 elem. 7 middle, 3 high school)
- Improved staff relations (31)
- None (no differences) (23)
- I work better with students (19)
  (all elem.)
- Staff worked together, cohesive (15)
- Professional growth, regeneration (15)
  (12 elem. 2 middle, 1 high school)
- Student behavior improved (14)
- Staff input in decision-making, goal setting, planning (12)
- School climate improved (11)
- Growth in our goal area (8)
- Staff commitment to goal (8)
  (7 middle, 1 elementary school)
- Improved staff morale (7)
- Improved staff communication (6)

- Improved relationship with parents (4)
- New insight into issues in education (4)
- School-wide focus (3)
- Consultants were helpful to me (3)
- Personal satisfaction (3)
- Improved staff, administrator relations (3)

The following responses were each found on just one separate questionnaire:

- I feel more appreciated
- Administrative support
- Administrator awareness of school problems
- Improved my leadership skills
- I am more aware of school problems
- Aware of new resources
- Attendance at conferences were helpful
- I recognize the need to change

Negative comments from this group include:

- We had a poor plan this year (4)
- Poor staff relations (2)
- No follow through (2)
- No staff input (2)
- Our school climate is worse (1)
- Lack of administrative leadership (1)
- We needed more time (1)
- More staff commitment is necessary (1)

## BUILDING LEADERSHIP TEAM

Of the 126 BLT members who responded to this survey, 92 (73%) responded to this question. 34 members (27%) did not (9 middle school, 25 elementary).

Responses were recorded in the following categories:

- Improved my classroom instruction (29)
  (25 elem. 3 middle, 1 high school)
- Improved staff relations (17)
- Improved staff input in decision-making (11)
- Improved my leadership skills (9)
- Better staff communication (7)
- Staff working together better, more cohesion (7)
- Improved student achievement (6)
- Increased personal motivation (6)
- More in touch with kids (6)
- Better discipline in my classroom (6)
- Improved school climate (5)
- Personal satisfaction (5)
- More aware of school goals (4)
- Greater awareness of curriculum issues, issues in education (4)
- More aware of need for change (3)
- New materials were helpful (2)

Each of the following were listed one time:

- New insight into school improveent
- Improved my people skills
- More insight into the change process
- Staff morale improved
- No difference to me
- Improved communication with parents
- Personal growth
- Better time management
- Better awareness of principal's job
- WSU facilitator was helpful
- Better problem solving strategies

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

Twenty-four (71%) of the administrators surveyed responded to this item while ten (29%) did ont record an opinion. Those who responded did so in the following way:

- More staff involvement in decision-making, commitment to goals (10)
- Improved my relationship, communication with staff (5)
- Helped staff work together better (4)
- Improved staff morale (2)
- Gratifying to see improvement (2)

One administrator made each of the following responses:

- Helped me facilitate change
- Funding, coordinator helped me
- Broader picture of education
- Better able to motivate staff
- Better able to help staff
- Developed strategies for problem solving
- Improved student achievement in my building
- More positive relationship with students
- Improved student behavior
- Improved school climate
- Improved parent communication
- Improved my leadership skills

## ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 17

This item asked persons to evaluate the C-SIP process. Many surveys listed specific steps in the process that they liked or did not like. Many surveys, however, commented on their specific building plan rather than the process. Nevertheless, all responses were recorded. Every effort was made to objectively categorize each response as outlined in the introduction to this section.

A table of the percent of surveys which listed a response to each of the three sections of this item is given below:

| | TEACHERS | BLT | BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17a. | 57% | 83% | 85% |
| b. | 39% | 56% | 53% |
| c. | 29% | 40% | 47% |

Please note the markedly lower percentages who responded to b. and c. This lower percentage could have occurred for a number of reasons including the fact that many people responded positively to the process and consequently had less to say about weaknesses and areas which need improvement. Also, people could have been reluctant to respond negatively if they were not sure who would be reading the critical comments.

When reading this analysis it is important to note these lower percentages and keep in mind that these are the opinions of only those who responded and may not be the opinions of the majority of participants.

### Item 17a.

The following table illustrates the number and percentages of people who noted one of the six steps of the C-SIP process as a strength:

| | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 | Step 6 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 65 (27%) | 53 (22%) | 42 (17%) | 40 (16%) | 28 (11%) | 17 (7%) | 245 |
| BLT | 30 (22%) | 38 (28%) | 24 (18%) | 25 (18%) | 11 (7%) | 9 (6%) | 137 |
| Bldg Admn | 5 (17%) | 10 (34%) | 4 (14%) | 6 (21%) | 1 (3%) | 3 (10%) | 29 |
| TOTAL | 100 (24%) | 1 (22%) | 70 (17%) | 71 (17%) | 40 (10%) | 29 (7%) | 411 |

Regarding Step 1, please note the higher percentage of teacher responses compared with BLT members and particularly building administrators. While these differences may not be significant, it is interesting to note that a greater percentage of teachers place importance upon this as a strength than administrators. The same note should be taken of the differences (reversed) in percentages for Step 2 and for Step 5. While the percentages for Step 5 are uniformly low, a difference does exist. Responses for Steps 3, 4, and 6 were similar for each group. Percentages for Steps 5 and 6 are lower than the other four steps. This could be because participants did not perceive these to be strengths, that these steps need to be improved, because these steps occur near the end of process and were not in place when the survey was done, or there could be other explanations as well.

Below are listed the most common categories of response and the number of responses for each for all groups. An examination of common responses between the three groups will follow.

TEACHERS

- The whole Process (43)
- Helped us identify, set, reach our goals and keep us focused (22)
- Staff involvement in process (14)
- Helped staff develop commitment to, ownership of plan (11)
- Improved staff communication (9)
- Staff worked together, cohesive (8)

BLT

- Staff involvement in (18)
  in process
- The whole process (13)
- Helped us identify, set, reach our goals and keep us focused (12)
- Helped staff develop commitment to, ownership of plan (6)

## BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS

- Staff involvement in process (9)
- Gave direction to our school improvement efforts (6)
- Helped staff develop commitment to, ownership of plan (4)
- Staff worked together, cohesive (4)
- The whole process (3)

Looking at the data from both of above tables, one can see a consistency of responses across the three groups to the strengths of the C-SIP program. In their identification of which steps were strengths and in their written comments, all three groups generally agreed. This agreement seems to indicate that all three groups view the strengths of this process similarly and thus C-SIP provides a good common framework for all groups to work together for school improvement.

## Item 17b

The following table illustrates the number and percentages of people who noted one of the six steps of the C-SIP process as a weakness:

| | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 5 | Step 6 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers | 19 (17%) | 9 (8%) | 6 (5%) | 32 (29%) | 25 (23%) | 20 (18%) | 111 |
| BLT | 2 (4%) | 8 (17%) | 1 (2%) | 13 (28%) | 15 (32%) | 8 (17%) | 47 |
| Bldg Admn | 0 (0%) | 3 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (17%) | 2 (34%) | 0 (0%) | 6 |
| TOTAL | 21 (13%) | 20 (12%) | 7 (4%) | 46 (28%) | 42 (26%) | 28 (17%) | 164 |

Of interest to note in this table are the teachers responses to Step 1 and the generally higher responses to Steps 4 and 5 as weaknesses of this plan. Several, but not a substanial number, of comments from teachers stated that more time was needed after becoming aware of the plan and before being asked to make a commitment. 50% of administrators commenting specifically on the steps of the process thought Step 2 was a weakness, however, this is a very limited sample and one should be cautious about drawing conclusions from it. A significant percentage in each group listed Step 4 as a weakness. These percentages are supported by statements in the comment section from all three groups that there needs to be improved staff commitment to implementation of the plan. Among teachers this was their highest category of response, among BLT members their fourth highest and among administrators their third highest. Comments similar to these were made in Item 17c as well.

Step 5 had the highest percentage of responses as a weakness. Administrators listed this with the highest rank in the comment section, but the number was small. Other groups do not support these percentages with their comments. Suggestions for improving Step 5 will be made in the comment section. All groups do not consider Step 3 a a weakness.

Below are listed the most common categories of responses and the number of responses per category for all groups:

**TEACHERS**

- Process too time consuming (19)
- Improve staff commitment to plan (19)
- None (no weaknesses) (12)
- Poor follow through on some steps (8)
- More staff input needed (7)

**BLT**

- More time to implement plan (10, all elem.)
- Narrow focus, limit goals (6)
- More staff involvement in process (4)
- Improve staff commitment to plan (4)

**ADMINISTRATORS**

- Plan too difficult to review, modify during year (3)
- Improve staff commitment to plan (3)
- Not enough time (3)

All three groups feel the lack of time is a problem. (Helping each building have a narrow focus and set realistic goals may help in this area).

As with 17a, it appears there is general agreement among members of all three groups on weaknesses of the C-SIP process. A review of data presented in this analysis section seems to justify this conclusion.

## Item 17c

A small percentage of those surveyed responded to this questionnaire item about improving C-SIP. Any conclusions from this data must be viewed cautiously.

Response categories for this item are as follows:

**TEACHERS**

- More commitment from staff to plan (17)
- More staff involvement in decision-making (10)
- More monitoring, reviewing, updating plan (10)
- More release time (8)
- Improve communication (8)

**BLT**

- More staff commitment to plan (7)
- More monitoring, updating plan (6)
- More time (6)

**ADMINISTRATORS**

- Improve staff commitment throughout process (4)
- Improve monitoring, reviewing, updating plan (3)

Despite the limited number of comments, all three groups recognize the need for improved staff commitment to the plan and more efforts to monitor progress of the plan. Suggestions for improvements in these areas will be made in the summary analysis section.

## ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM #19

### Introduction

A table of the percent of surveys which listed a response to each of the sections of this item is given:

| | Teachers | BLT | Building Administrators |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19a | 56% | 76% | 82% |
| b | 49% | 73% | 71% |

Every attempt was made to objectively categorize each response. There were no pre-determined categories when recording and tabulations began. Instead categories emerged, changed, were combined, or deleted as necessary. While it may appear that some categories are similar and could possible have been combined, efforts were made to keep enough categories so the data would not become diluted because of too few categories.

Because of the larger number of elementary personnel in each category, this data is weighted in the direction of those responses. The number of responses in each category is listed by level when significant to show the impact each level had on the total number.

### Item 19a

Below is listed the most common categories of response and the number of responses to each category for all groups.

**TEACHERS**

- Positive impact on students (38) (29 elem.)
- Staff identified, set, and worked to accomplish goals (26)
- Staff worked together, cohesive (26)
- We made progress toward accomplishing our goal (25)
- Improved classroom instruction (24)
- Improved school climate (23)
- Positive impact on building (19)

**BLT**

- Staff worked together, cohesive (19)
- Improved student achievement ( all elem.) (15)
- Staff identified, set, and worked to accomplish goals (12)
- Positive impact on building (11)
- Improved communication (10)
- Improved classroom Instruction (9)

**ADMINISTRATORS**

- Staff worked together, cohesive (8)
- Positive impact on building (7)
- Staff ownership of, commitment to plan (6)
- Improved staff relations ( 5)
- Improved school climate (4)
- Improved staff morale (4)

Note the number of items in each group's list that speak to the impact of school improvement projects and the C-SIP process on improving staff relationships. This impact could have been because improving various aspects of staff relations were the school improvement target goals. Whether they were or were not, people in all groups recognize the contribution C-SIP makes to improving staff relationships. All three goups have "Staff work together, cohesive "and" staff identified, set, and worked to accomplish goals" in a position of high ranking. All three groups listed "positive impact on building" as an important outcome.

In addition, one should note that teacher and BLT member groups responses include a higher number of comments on students and classroom instruction as well as comments about improved staff relations. Administrator comments focus on staff issues and do not mention student achievement or classroom instruction as a benefit for the school.

## Item 19h

Even though this item asked people to respond by writing about how their school improvement plan affected them personally, many people mentioned things that related more to the school as a whole. Nevertheless, all responses to this item were included in a category.

**TEACHERS**

- Improved classroom instruction (49) (40 elem. 7 MS, 2 HS)
- Improved student achievement or some benefit to students (32) (22 elem., 7 MS, 3HS)
- Improved staff relations (31)
- None (no impact) (23)
- I worked better with students (19)
- Staff cohesion (15)
- Professional growth (15)

**BLT**

- Improved classroom instruction (29) (25 elem., 2 MS, 1 HS)
- Improved staff relations (17)
- Staff input in school decision decision-making (11)
- Improved my leadership skills (9)
- Improved staff communication (7)
- Staff cohesion (7)
- Staff cohesion improved student achievement (6)

## Administration

- Staff involvement in decision-making, commitment (10)
- Improved my relations, communication with staff (5)
- Staff cohesion (4)

Please note from these three lists how, as in item 19a, teachers and BLT members frequently mentioned improved classroom instruction, benefits for students, and improved student achievement. Administrators mentioned only issues relating to improved staff relationships. Improved instruction may have been the garget goal in several buildings, but whether it was or not, teachers and BLT members felt the outcomes had an impact in this area. Administrators may not see student outcomes as an important by-product of their involvement with C-SIP. Improved staff relations were mentioned by all three groups. Improved staff and administrator relations were mentioned only by administrators.

# SUMMARY ANALYSIS

## SUMMARY ANALYSIS

This section will make some general comments about the data for all groups and all questionnaire items, pointed out perceived strengths and weaknesses of C-SIP based on working with this data, and offer suggestions for improving the process.

### General Comments

The responses from participants showed high levels of agreement with C-SIP goals and concepts across all groups and all levels. While some schools were more in agreement than others, two schools in particular responded with the high levels of disagreement. The impact of these two schools on the data was outlied in the analysis sections for questionnaire items 1-16 and the student achievement items. Because of the high number of positive responses and comments about C-SIP from the remaining C-SIP schools, one might say that failure to reach goals could have been more a result of problems at those two building rather than due to problems with the C-SIP model.

The low number of responses to questionnaire items 17b and c by all participants could be due to their general contentment with the process or a number of other reasons. There could be many more negative feelings about C-SIP among participants that were not expressed for one reason or another. If there were large numbers of people disenchanted with C-SIP, however, their feelings likely would have surfaced in the anonymous responses given to items 1-16.

- The issue about ownership of the school improvement plan and its affect on levels of agreement among the three groups may be supported by the data from questionnaire item 18. A pattern similar to the one marking decreasing levels of agreement from administrators to BLT members to teachers can be seen in the item 18 data as well. Administrators have the highest level of optimum about the continuation of C-SIP after funding, followed by BLT members, then teachers. Teachers may feel they have less control over the planning, implementation, and outcome of the plan and hence feel less optimistic about being able to control whether or not the plan continues.

- There was little mention throughout the narrative items about teaching staff and building administrator relationships. Even though the C-SIP demands a good deal of interaction and communication between these groups, few participants listed this as a strength, an area to improve, or a by-product of school improvement planning. There were many comments about improved staff relations, however, which could have included all professional staff, not just teachers.

- Similarly, there was very little mention of the benefits of the additional funding provided by C-SIP or of the benefits or drawbacks of the Wayne State facilitators working with each school. A questionnaire item could be added in the future to gather information on how or why the facilitators are helpful and what they can do to provide more effective services.

- Even though this was mentioned in earlier analysis sections, it is important to point out that in questionnaire items 17a and b all three groups show general agreement about strengths and weaknesses of the process and the model. C-SIP is a model that is viewed similarly and positively by three groups. Therefore it provides a good framework for all staff members to work together for school improvement. Despite different levels of agreement between building administrators, BLT members, and teachers, there is much agreement between the groups on why the process works and what benefit it has for school buildings and staff in those buildings.

## STRENGTHS OF C-SIP - WHY IT WORKS

With the exception of the two schools with high numbers of "Disagree" responses, it is difficult to dispute whether or not the C-SIP process works. Responses to all nineteen questionnaire items from all supports the effectiveness of the process. Some reasons why this process is effective may include:

1. The process involves all school members who have an investment in its outcome. This is not a top-down school improvement plan, but one which allows each school to generate its own plan with significant staff involvement in all phases of the process.

2. Teachers and building administrators develop a cooperative relationship based on mutually agreed upon goals and an equal voice in decision-making.

3. the process helps buildings decide upon a common focus for their school improvement efforts with goals agreed upon by a consensus for staff.

4 Ownership for success of the plan is built by active involvement of staff in all phases of the process.

5. Involvementin the process meets some basic human and psychological needs for people.

6. Areas for improving the school are generated from a needs assessment done by staff and are not restricted to specific areas, like effective schools relates. Because of the absence of restrictions, the staff can work on the area of most critical need. Having this choice helps build commitment to the plan and helps movement toward improving the most vital areas of a school.

7. The plan makes sense, is logical, orderly, systematic, and thorough. Data from all groups supports this assertion.

8. A facilitator is provided to help make sure the process is implemented correctly, to provide guidance as needed, and to help solve problems which may be related to certain dynamics in the building.

9. The funding provides help in various ways. The release time, materials, consultant fees or conference fees it provides aid the successful planning and implementation of goals. Also, the money provides an important psychological boost to participants by providing extra things normally not available. The money helps give an importance or significance to the work.

10. The process includes some of the important elements of the change process, especially in the early stages of personal change. Making a three year commitment to C-SIP in the initial year is another important element of helping people make changes.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

This section will address three areas identified by participants as areas that need to be strengthened:

1. **TIME** A good number of participants said the process was too time consuming or that there was not enough time to complete the plan. Suggestions in this area would include:

- facilitators helping schools be realistic about what can be accomplished in the time given and with the constraints of normal school duties. This means narrowing the focus to a very small and manageable number of specific goals. More planning time spent in Steps 2 and 3 may mean greater satisfaction with accomplishments at the end of the year.

- Staff members should give themselves more than one year to accomplish an important goal. successful implementatoin of an innovation, especially with a large number of people, takes three to five years. Without a time commitment of this kind, accomplishments may be incomplete or forgotten about without a long term focus or their implementation Focusing on the same goal or same set of goals for more than one year will help insure their institutionalization in a school.

2. **STAFF COMMITMENT** A significant number of comments were made about increasing staff commitment to implementation of school plans. These comments indicate unhappiness with staff members who do not implement the plan or did so half-heartedly. Suggestios for increasing commitment include:

- make sure you are reaching consensus and not just majority rule in decision-making. This includes giving enough time so this kind of agreement can be reached.

- in large schools, use middle schools or high schools, it probably is difficult for large numbers of people to reach agreement on a common goal. Perhaps more teachers would make a stronger commitment to a departmental goal or grade-level goal, one that would have more directly impact on individuals.

- research on the change process shows that after the initial awareness of an innovation, group needs became much less important than individual needs. Group monitoring and review is not nearly as helpful as identification of individual needs and support for those needs. This individual help and monitoring can be done by BLT members, teachers helping (not supervising or evaluating) each other, or by building administration if relationships with staff will support this kind of intervention.

- more awareness of the change process is necessary for all participants but particularly for building administrators and BLT members. This information is vital for effective planning and implement action.

3. MONITORING, REVIEW UPDATING PLANS

- It is important that time be built into staff meetings or inservice release time to do this monitoring, reviewing, and updating. This may aid with the problem of commitment by staff if the plan is discussed periodically during the implementation phase. Adjustments may need to be made in the plan or by members responsible for carrying out certain aspects of the plan. A discussion of successes and failures may be helpful. Most importantly, there should be a plan for implementation of the plan. This plan may include timelines, delineation of responsibilities, and times for discussion. Without a solid plan for implementation the goals are less likely to be accomplished.

Finally, the data generated in this study indicates that schools can and do improve using the C-SIP model; that the process of school

improvement can hold many important by-products for a school and staff in addition to the goals set for the plan,; and that teachers will support school improvement if they are given a legitimate role in the process and the direction of the school improvement effort.

# APPENDICES TABLES, A, B, C, D, E

# Appendix A

## List of Tables

### Questinnaire Items 1-16


| Table Number | Contents of Table | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | All Groups, All Levels | 11 |
| 2 | All Teachers, All Levels | 15 |
| 3 | All BLT Members, All Levels | 18 |
| 4 | All Administrators, All Levels | 21 |
| 5 | Elementary Teachers, All Cycle Years | 25 |
| 6 | Middle School Teacher, All Cycle Years | 28 |
| 7 | High School Teachers, All Cycle Years | 31 |
| 8 | Elementary BLT, All Cycle Years | 34 |
| 9 | Middle School BLT, All Cycle Years | 37 |
| 10 | High School BLT, All Cycle Years | 39 |
| 11 | Elementary Administrators, All Cycle Years | 42 |
| 12 | Middle School Administrators, All Cycle Years | 45 |
| 13 | High School Administrators, All Cycle Years | 47 |


### Individual School Tables
### Questionnaire Items 1-16


| Table Number | School Number | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 14 | 66 | 57 |
| 15 | 67 | 58 |
| 16 | 68 | 59 |
| 17 | 62 | 60 |
| 18 | 63 | 61 |
| 19 | 64 | 62 |
| 20 | 65 | 63 |
| 21 | 49 | 64 |

| Table Number | School Number | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 22 | 51 | 65 |
| 23 | 52 | 66 |
| 24 | 53 | 67 |
| 25 | 54 | 68 |
| 26 | 55 | 69 |
| 27 | 57 | 70 |
| 28 | 58 | 71 |
| 29 | 60 | 72 |
| 30 | 61 | 73 |
| 32 | 42 | 75 |
| 33 | 47 | 76 |
| 34 | 33 | 77 |
| 35 | 34 | 78 |
| 36 | 70 | 79 |
| 37 | 71 | 80 |
| 38 | 50 | 81 |
| 39 | 59 | 82 |
| 40 | 46 | 83 |
| 41 | 69 | 84 |
| 42 | 48 | 85 |
| 31 | 42 | 74 |

## Questinnaire Items 6,7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15
## Student Achievement


| Table Number | Contents of Table | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 43 | All Groups, All Levels | 89 |
| 44 | All Teachers, All Levels | 92 |
| 45 | All BLT Members, All Levels | 95 |
| 46 | All Administrators, All Levels | 98 |
| 47 | Elementary Teachers, All Cycle Years | 101 |
| 48 | Middle School Teachers, All Cycle Years | 105 |
| 49 | High School Teachers, All Cycle Years | 108 |
| 50 | Elementary BLT, All Cycle Years | 111 |
| 51 | Middle School BLT, All Cycle Years | 114 |
| 52 | High School BLT, All Cycle Years | 117 |
| 53 | Elementary Administrators, All Cycle Years | 120 |
| 54 | Middle School Administrators, All Cycle years | 123 |
| 55 | High School Administrators, All Cycle Years | 125 |


## Individual School Tables

## Student Achievement


| Table Number | School Number | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 56 | 66 | 130 |
| 57 | 67 | 131 |
| 58 | 68 | 132 |
| 59 | 62 | 133 |
| 60 | 63 | 134 |
| 61 | 64 | 135 |
| 62 | 65 | 136 |
| 63 | 49 | 137 |
| 64 | 51 | 138 |

| Table Number | School Number | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 65 | 52 | 139 |
| 66 | 53 | 140 |
| 67 | 54 | 141 |
| 68 | 55 | 142 |
| 69 | 57 | 143 |
| 70 | 58 | 144 |
| 71 | 60 | 145 |
| 72 | 61 | 146 |
| 73 | 42 | 147 |
| 74 | 44 | 148 |
| 75 | 47 | 149 |
| 76 | 33 | 150 |
| 77 | 34 | 151 |
| 78 | 70 | 152 |
| 79 | 71 | 153 |
| 80 | 50 | 154 |
| 81 | 59 | 155 |
| 82 | 46 | 156 |
| 83 | 69 | 157 |
| 84 | 48 | 158 |

# APPENDIX, TABLE B

## FUNDING

Wayne State University provides facilitators and funding from state appropriations to carry out the C-SIP program at individual buildings. Participating schools are awarded grants as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Orientation (start up) | | $ 900 |
| First -Year Funding | (up to) | 3000 |
| Second-Year Funding | (up to) | 2500 |
| Third-Year Funding | | 1000 |
| Transition to "Institutionalization | (up to) | 500 |
| District's Commitment to "Institutionalization" | | 500 |

The amount of money awarded each school is based on the yearly improvement plan submitted by each school to Wayne State University. Grant money can be used for substitute teachers, to pay stipends, for consultant fees, to attend conferences, or for other purposes deemed legitimate for successful planning and implementation. Funding is subject to approval of a plan submitted annually for each year of the three year cycle. In addition, up to $500 can be awarded to help a school "institutionalize" school improvement planning. This money is designed to help schools continue this process and incorporate the model on an annual basis after funding from the grant has expired. To receive this "institutionalization" money, the local school district must also provide five hundred dollars to aid with incorporation of the model.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
C-SIP EVALUATION

Teacher Questionnaire

School _____ District _____ Date _____

Please respond to the following statements by circling the appropriate category.

As a result of my participation as a teacher in C-SIP during the 1988-89 school year:

1. I acquired practical knowledge and I was able to apply this knowledge to my leadership activities as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2. I learned new and/or enhanced my leadership skills as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. I experienced changes in my attitude that resulted in improved leadership performance and strategies as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

4. I had an active voice in determining the direction of change that occurred in my school as a result of my school's participation in C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

5. I claim partial ownership of the change process that occurred during the 1988-89 school year as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. Change resulting in an improved school climate occurred during the 1988-89 school year as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

7. Students in my school experienced an improvement in academic performance as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

8. Teachers experienced an improvement in their instructional skills as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

9. Improvements in curriculum occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

10. Changes resulting in improved teaching strategies occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

11. The major goal chosen by our staff as the focus of C-SIP for the 1988-89 school year was the most important issue confronting the school at the time. (EXCLUDE ANY ISSUE OR GOAL FOR WHICH THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS)

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

12. There were no other goals for 1988-89 that were more important than the one chosen. (EXCLUDE ANY OTHER ISSUE OR GOAL FOR WHICH THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS)

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

13. My participation in C-SIP was a rewarding experience.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

14. The goal chosen by our school staff for the 1988-89 school year was attained.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

15. Improvements in building administrative strategies occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. The coordinator/facilitator is an important component of C- SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

17. Consider the Six Step Process:

Step 1. Awareness, Readiness, and Commitment
Step 2. Interactive Needs Assessment
Step 3. The Plan and Its Approval
Step 4. Implementation
Step 5. Reporting and Evaluation
Step 6. Adoption

a. What were the strengths of the Six Step Process?

b. What were the weaknesses of the Six Step Process?

c. What suggestions do you have for improvement?

18. To what degree do you believe this Six Step Process will continue in your building once the special funding comes to a close?

I believe that the Six Step Process will:

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue |
|---|---|---|---|

Comments:

19. a. How do you feel about your school improvement project (C-SIP)? How is it going and what differences is it making in your school? Please answer in complete sentences.

b. What differences for you personally can you cite that are the result of your school's participation in C-SIP? Please answer in complete sentences.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
C-SIP EVALUATION

## Building Level Team (BLT) Questionnaire

School _____ District _____ Date _____

Please respond to the following statements by circling the appropriate category.

As a result of my participation as a member of the BLT in C-SIP during the 1988-89 school year:

1. I acquired practical knowledge and I was able to apply this knowledge to my leadership activities as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2. I learned new and/or enhanced my leadership skills as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. I experienced changes in my attitude that resulted in improved leadership performance and strategies as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

4. I had an active voice in determining the direction of change that occurred in my school as a result of my school's participation in C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

5. I claim partial ownership of the change process that occurred during the 1988-89 school year as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. Change resulting in an improved school climate occurred during the 1988-89 school year as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

7. Students in my school experienced an improvement in academic performance as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

8. Teachers experienced an improvement in their instructional skills as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

9. Improvements in curriculum occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

10. Changes resulting in improved teaching strategies occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

11. The major goal chosen by our staff as the focus of C-SIP for the 1988-89 school year was the most important issue confronting the school at the time. (EXCLUDE ANY ISSUE OR GOAL FOR WHICH THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS)

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

12. There were no other goals for 1988-89 that were more important than the one chosen. (EXCLUDE ANY OTHER ISSUE OR GOAL FOR WHICH THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS)

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

13. My participation in C-SIP was a rewarding experience.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

14. The goal chosen by our school staff for the 1988-89 school year was attained.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

15. Improvements in building administrative strategies occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. The coordinator/facilitator is an important component of C- SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

17. Consider the Six Step Process:

Step 1. Awareness, Readiness, and Commitment
Step 2. Interactive Needs Assessment
Step 3. The Plan and Its Approval
Step 4. Implementation
Step 5. Reporting and Evaluation
Step 6. Adoption

a. What were the strengths of the Six Step Process?

b. What were the weaknesses of the Six Step Process?

c. What suggestions do you have for improvement?

18. To what degree do you believe this Six Step Process will continue in your building once the special funding comes to a close?

I believe that the Six Step Process will:

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue |
|---|---|---|---|

Comments:

19. a. How do you feel about your school improvement project (C-SIP)? How is it going and what differences is it making in your school? Please answer in complete sentences.

b. What differences for you personally can you cite that are the result of your school's participation in C-SIP? Please answer in complete sentences.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
C-SIP EVALUATION

Building Principal Questionnaire

School _____ District _____ Date _____

Please respond to the following statements by circling the appropriate category.

As a result of my participation as Building Principal in C-SIP during the 1988-89 school year:

1. I acquired practical knowledge and I was able to apply this knowledge to my leadership activities as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2. I learned new and/or enhanced my leadership skills as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. I experienced changes in my attitude that resulted in improved leadership performance and strategies as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

4. I had an active voice in determining the direction of change that occurred in my school as a result of my school's participation in C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

5. I claim partial ownership of the change process that occurred during the 1988-89 school year as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. Change resulting in an improved school climate occurred during the 1988-89 school year as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

7. Students in my school experienced an improvement in academic performance as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

8. Teachers experienced an improvement in their instructional skills as a result of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

9. Improvements in curriculum occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

10. Changes resulting in improved teaching strategies occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

11. The major goal chosen by our staff as the focus of C-SIP for the 1988-89 school year was the most important issue confronting the school at the time. (EXCLUDE ANY ISSUE OR GOAL FOR WHICH THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS)

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

12. There were no other goals for 1988-89 that were more important than the one chosen. (EXCLUDE ANY OTHER ISSUE OR GOAL FOR WHICH THERE WERE INSUFFICIENT FUNDS)

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

13. My participation in C-SIP was a rewarding experience.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

14. The goal chosen by our school staff for the 1988-89 school year was attained.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

15. Improvements in building administrative strategies occurred because of C-SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. The coordinator/facilitator is an important component of C- SIP.

| Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

17. Consider the Six Step Process:

Step 1. Awareness, Readiness, and Commitment
Step 2. Interactive Needs Assessment
Step 3. The Plan and Its Approval
Step 4. Implementation
Step 5. Reporting and Evaluation
Step 6. Adoption

a. What were the strengths of the Six Step Process?

b. What were the weaknesses of the Six Step Process?

c. What suggestions do you have for improvement?

18. To what degree do you believe this Six Step Process will continue in your building once the special funding comes to a close?

I believe that the Six Step Process will:

| Definitely Continue | Probably Continue | Probably Not Continue | Definitely Not Continue |
|---|---|---|---|

Comments:

19. a. How do you feel about your school improvement project (C-SIP)? How is it going and what differences is it making in your school? Please answer in complete sentences.

b. What differences for you personally can you cite that are the result of your school's participation in C-SIP? Please answer in complete sentences.